

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXIV, No. 22 }
WHOLE No. 598 }

March 19, 1921

{ \$4.00 A YEAR
PRICE, 10 CENTS }

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	513-516
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Bolshevism in Schools—Truman Talley, the World's Work, the Pope—How the Novel Differs From the Drama—The Twelve-Hour Day in Steel.....	517-525
COMMUNICATIONS	525-527
EDITORIALS	
What Shall We Do with the Movies?— Ladies of the Jury!—The Hanging of the Crane—The Church the Teacher of Courtesy.....	528-530
LITERATURE	
Poets' Poets—St. Joseph's Summons—Re- views—Books and Authors.....	530-533
SOCIOLOGY	
Socialism in Spain.....	533-534
EDUCATION	
Charles Coppens, Patriot and Pioneer.....	534-536
NOTE AND COMMENT	536

Chronicle

Peace Conference.—Having failed to receive from the German Government either acceptance of the Paris proposals or counter-proposals of an equivalent value, the Allies carried out their threat of occupying Duisberg, Duesseldorf and Ruhrort. Future German action is conditioned by the results of the plebiscite, which is to determine the status of Upper Silesia, March 27.

The German proposals, several times amended, have not been published in detail, but according to Mr. Lloyd George, they amounted to a promise that the Germans would endeavor to pay the annuities fixed by the Paris proposals for the first five years by floating a loan. This Dr. Simons declared would involve colossal sacrifices on the part of the German people. He made it a condition of his proposals that Upper Silesia should be retained by Germany, and that after five years another conference should be held to determine what Germany should do for the twenty-five succeeding years. The capital point made by the Allies in their ultimatum, namely, that Germany should accept responsibility for the war, was brushed aside by Dr. Simons, and he was at pains to show that the penalties of which the Allies had spoken were contrary to the terms of the Versailles Treaty.

The decision of the Allies was voiced, on March 7, by Mr. Lloyd George, who called attention to the repudiation of responsibility on the part of the Germans, and to the insincerity of their proposals. Their plan, he said, was wholly lacking in that definiteness which was essential for the restoration of economic conditions. At the most, it called for a program extending over five years only, and covering only a very small part of the sum set by the Paris Conference. But even this plan was specious rather than real, for in the event of the plebiscite assigning Upper Silesia to Poland rather than to Germany, the German delegates could return to the matter and declare that their offer had been merely provisional, depending, as it did, on the retention by Germany of Upper Silesia.

Commenting on Dr. Simons' statement that colossal sacrifices would have to be made by the German people to pay even the amount of reparations called for in the German plan, the British Premier declared that the sacrifice which Germany proposed to make during the present year to satisfy all the Allies amounted to one-fourth of the sum that England would have to raise this same year for war-debt charges and pensions. The difference in the figures, he declared, was made the more striking when it is remembered that the population of Great Britain, including Ireland, is 10,000,000 less than that of Germany, and of this number 1,000,000 were unemployed. The inadequacy of Germany's proposals was the more striking if compared with the sum that France has to raise during the present year. France alone, he said, has to raise this year, in order to meet war charges, a sum that is nine times as large as the sum Germany would have to raise to meet the demands of all the Allies, and this notwithstanding the fact that Germany has a population exceeding that of France by at least 12,000,000. Under these circumstances he did not think that the sacrifice which Germany proposed to make could be called colossal.

Two points were essential to an agreement, said Mr. Lloyd George; a definite amount of reparations to be paid, and a definite method of payment.

Those are two questions which must be settled between Germany and ourselves, and settled immediately. The proposals put forward by Dr. Simons do not carry out any of these objects. They are neither the Paris proposals nor their equivalent. I am afraid—and Dr. Simons will forgive me for saying this—he is not really in a position to negotiate. He represents, and he is returning to report to, public opinion which is not ready to pay this debt. In the interests of the Allies, in the interests of Germany and in the interests of the world, we must have a settlement, we must have a definite settlement and we must have an immediate settlement. Proposals such as those

we have heard are not a settlement. They simply evade and postpone settlement, and very regretfully we have come to the conclusion that sanctions must be put into operation immediately.

Dr. Simons made a short reply to this final announcement that the sanctions would be applied immediately. He deprecated the fear entertained by the Allies that the provisional agreement he had suggested would be used after the lapse of five years to obtain a revision of the whole treaty. The Germans, he said, had undertaken the obligation of making reparation and were prepared to do so to the limits of possibility. He agreed that certain points which had been proposed by the Allies were susceptible of future discussion, but declared that the enforcement of sanctions would embitter the whole discussion. "I feel obliged," he concluded, "at this moment when sanctions are definitely going to be put in force against us, once more to enter, with all due stress, a protest against this, your procedure." With these words the conference came to an end and the following day the German delegates left London. Subsequently the German Ambassadors to London and Paris were summoned to Berlin.

On March 8, in the early morning, Belgian, British and French troops occupied the cities mentioned in the ultimatum. There was no demonstration of any kind on the part of the inhabitants, even when a proclamation was posted on all public buildings, declaring that the Germans had shown their unwillingness to fulfil their engagements and that in consequence the Allies had "decided to assure themselves new guarantees in order to force the German Government to execute the clauses of the treaty." The proclamation stated that no hostile intentions were entertained towards the populace, and that there would be no unnecessary interference with economic life.

Another proclamation was made on March 8 in Berlin, in which Frederick Ebert, the German President, declared that the Allies had imposed terms unheard of and impossible of fulfilment, terms which the German people must not and could not comply with. He maintained that the occupation of German territory was an open breach of the Versailles Treaty, against which the Germans were not in a position to offer resistance. Right, he said, was being downtrodden by might. He urged the German people to refrain from inconsidered acts, and promised that "the Imperial Government will not rest until the foreign power yields before our right." On March 12 the Reichstag, by a vote of 268 to 49, passed a resolution approving of the action of the Government on the reparations question.

Ireland.—The past week has been a sad one for Ireland. Following the death of Brigadier General Cumming came the deaths of the Mayor and the ex-Mayor of Limerick; and so the tragedy went on, life for life, blood for blood, to the disgrace of England who boasts

of democracy and murders people who dare aspire to decent government. The woes of the Irish nation are eloquently told in the following letters. The first communication, written by Cardinal Logue to Bishop Amigo of Southwark, reads as follows:

With the assistance of the priests, I have done my best to keep things quiet in this diocese. Hitherto we have had comparative peace, but the forces of the Crown seem determined that we shall suffer like the rest. There is a camp of Black and Tans at Gormanstown, on the borders of the diocese, and while that camp remains, we may give up all hopes of peace or safety. It seems to be a nest of bandits and homicides. In the month of December they visited Ardee, a country town, which was, and is, perfectly peaceful. As far as I could ascertain, there was not a murder in the whole district for a hundred years. Those guardians of the peace invaded the house of the principal merchant and carried away a quantity of goods to the amount of £150.

Their next visit to Ardee was made under their officers in lorries, some of the men having their faces blackened. They dragged two poor young men out of bed in the small hours of the morning, and shot them dead. Others would have met the same fate, but fortunately took the alarm in time and were absent when sought for. Their last exploit in Ardee was to seize the whole stock-in-trade of two young people, a brother and sister, and load it on their lorries. These young people kept a draper's shop, and there is nothing left to them—hardly a reel of thread. Their loss amounted to £1,500 or £2,000 and now they are ruined. The people about Drogheda and the surrounding country will soon be reduced to beggary. Their houses are raided day and night on pretext of a search, and money, valuables and anything that can be carried away, seized at the point of the revolver. As an instance, one man who was raided and lost heavily some time since, has just lost £400 in a second raid. Those who sell cattle or farm produce have not time to put the money in the bank for safety before it is seized upon. The poor people are afraid to complain lest their houses be burned down.

Hitherto it was only robbery in the Drogheda district, now bloodshed has commenced. A few nights since two young men, fathers of families, were taken from their beds at dead of night, brought to a lonely place by armed men, and were found shot dead there next morning. There is not even the excuse of reprisals for this action. There was no crime in Drogheda and the district, except robbery, to which I have referred. You may judge, my dear Lord, how vain it is to counsel peace or secure a spirit of peace and charity in such surroundings.

The second pronouncement is that of the Bishop of Killaloe:

Our country is steeped in suffering; no one escapes it; it is around us like a flood, in a terrorism which will make for future generations to read one of the most disgraceful pages in history. The helpless people are being beaten, robbed, and murdered all over the place. Not a tithe of the outrages committed on them appears in the papers. Every townland has its tales of woe; the jails and the graves are full. The heroism with which people face and endure this daily martyrdom is a spiritual marvel. Nothing but the supreme and sustaining power of faith can explain it. No one wants violence, but even though the violence complained of on the Irish side were infinitely greater than it is, it would not justify the savage barbarity now practised on our people, innocent and guilty alike.

His Lordship does not hesitate to name the outrages which include the invasion of convents and the flog-

ging and murder of priests. Lastly Lady Sykes writes in the London *Times* in the following manner:

The accepted laws of Christianity and civilization have been set aside, and in their place an attempt is being made to crush the Irish people by methods identical with those employed by the Germans in Belgium, and universally condemned. I have seen for myself some of the destruction wrought by the forces of the Crown, official and unofficial reprisals, upon the Irish population; I have seen the ruins in Cork City, the blackened remains of creameries, of co-operative stores, of houses, in towns and country villages. I have spoken with the mothers of sons who have been shot at sight, without trial; I have seen in a prison hospital a boy of eighteen against whom there was no charge, who had been beaten about the head and body with the butt-ends of rifles till unconscious. I have heard from the lips of a sergeant of police that the place where he was stationed was quiet, but that he had just been out to a village near with some of his men to give a dozen young fellows a good beating.

These things are happening daily, and of the brutal and frequent murders committed by the Black and Tans no mention is allowed to be made in the English press. Raids and robberies by the military and auxiliaries are of nightly occurrence, entailing cruelty and suffering upon women and children; nobody knows when his turn may come. These things are being done in the name of England. In America and on the continent of Europe our name is becoming a byword. Has the war so blunted our sensitiveness that we do not feel the disgrace that is being laid upon us? Is it not time for the people of England to rise up in their wrath, and insist that their elected representatives shall put an immediate end to these shameful deeds that are being done in their name?

Thus do decency and civilization blush before the face of England.

Rome.—His Grace, the Most Rev. Denis J. Dougherty, Archbishop of Philadelphia, together with Juan Benlloch y Vivo, Archbishop of Burgos; Francisco Vidal y Barraquer, Archbishop of Tarragona; Francisco Ragonesi, Papal Nuncio in Madrid; Josef Schulte, Archbishop of Cologne, and Michael von Faulhaber, Archbishop of Munich, were created Cardinals by his Holiness, Pope Benedict XV, after a secret Consistory held in the Vatican, March 7. When the ceremonies preceding the formal opening of the Consistory were concluded, the Holy Father addressed the members of the Sacred College in an allocution, considered one of the most striking of his Pontificate.

He told the assembled Cardinals that he was rejoiced to be among them, and that he would like to be the bearer of good news. But unfortunately, the sadness of the times warranted no such tidings. Actual war, he stated, civil dissensions and discord caused him the greatest anxiety. He furthermore declared that he had made every possible endeavor to restore peace and tranquillity in human society, as the Church had ever done in the past. He added that he had attempted this on the occasion of the seventh centenary of the foundation of the Third Order of St. Francis, who in troublous times, had succeeded in restoring peace to the world through the teachings of the Faith. Unless, he declared, the individ-

ual is reformed, peace is now impossible and treaties already signed will remain a dead letter. We witness, he stated, in some countries, bitter civil strife with disastrous results. "Elsewhere we see races that were born and grew up in the same lands, struggle in arms for this land inch by inch, thus sowing the seeds of discord. Besides we see ancient struggles renewed and the outbreak of appalling violence in contradiction to the laws of morality and humanity, which we condemn, from whatever side it comes."

In conclusion the Pontiff said:

All agree that the peace treaties concluded will lead to nothing unless the spirits of citizens are permeated by those sentiments of justice and charity, which the Christian doctrines inculcate, and which in the time of Saint Francis were so efficacious. If in all individuals cupidity is repressed or turned to good ends, society will feel the beneficent effects; and also, if, from mutual, fraternal love, all classes of citizens feel as Christians should feel, a reciprocal confidence will blossom which will help better than anything else to establish and maintain peace.

The list of the new Cardinals having been read, the Holy Father inquired as each name was pronounced: "*Quid vobis videtur?*" "What is your verdict?" After a favorable answer was given, the Pontiff formally declared the election of the six new members of the Sacred College. Papal emissaries were then immediately dispatched to the American College, where Cardinal Dougherty was staying, bearing the "*biglietto*" or official notice of his elevation to the Sacred College. Cardinals Schulte and von Faulhaber received similar notification. The "*biglietto*" was read to the new American "*Porporato*" by Monsignor Cerretti, the Papal Under-Secretary of State. In reply, the Cardinal expressed his great thanks to the Holy Father for the honor conferred on him and through him on all American Catholics, adding that the creation of a new Cardinal in the United States had been welcomed by all Americans. Immediately after, Church dignitaries and diplomats accredited to the Holy See called upon the Cardinal to congratulate him on his newly acquired honors. Among the callers were the German and Bavarian ambassadors.

On March 9 the Holy Father conferred upon the new Cardinals the red biretta as the first tangible proof of their new dignity. Cardinal Dougherty thanked the Pontiff in his own name and that of his colleagues, assuring him of their gratitude and their lasting loyalty to his own august person and the Church. Cardinals Schulte and von Faulhaber also spoke. The Pope then addressed them individually. Referring to Cardinal Dougherty, he recalled his devotion as Bishop, both in the Philippines and in America, and praised his admirable administrative powers.

The following day, March 10, after the three Cardinals had taken the oath of allegiance to the Holy See, the Pope, adhering to the solemn ceremonies used on such occasions, conferred upon them the red hat and ring, made them titulars of a Church in Rome, thus formally

admitting them to full and active membership in the Sacred College. The ceremony closed with a solemn *Te Deum* in the Sistine Chapel. According to a custom approved by the Holy See, the three Spanish Cardinals will receive the insignia of their office from the King of Spain.

The first news which reached the Holy Father of the fire which recently ravaged the basilica of Loretto seemed to imply that the Holy House had been destroyed. Subsequent and more reliable dispatches, however, stated that the altar and the famous wooden statue of Our Lady were the only objects irretrievably lost. The walls of the Holy House, which so many sacred memories render dear to the heart of the Catholic world, are still intact, though injured.

Scandinavia.—In his solicitude for the welfare of the Universal Church, says the *Osservatore Romano*, the Holy Father has brought back to its former activities one of the oldest institutions of the Papacy, that of Apostolic Visitors.

**Catholic
Progress**

Some of these Apostolic Visitors have already been sent by the Pope on special missions to Poland, Siberia, Egypt, Mesopotamia, Palestine, to the Caucasus and to China. As is well known, Benedict XV is showing the most paternal interest in the welfare of the Catholics of northern Europe, and more particularly in the small but fervent communities of Sweden, Denmark and Norway. Mgr. F. Dieppen, Bishop of Bois-le-Duc, was appointed Apostolic Visitor to these three countries and commissioned by the Holy Father to study their actual conditions and report on what may be considered the most favorable and efficacious means for the spread of the Faith.

The statistics of the Scandinavian countries for 1920 give the following as the number of Catholics there. In a population of 5,200,000, Sweden numbers 2,558 Catholics. Denmark has 2,300,000 inhabitants, but only 8,780 Catholics; Norway counts but 2,609 Catholics, lost so to say, among its 4,225,000 inhabitants. To this number, Denmark adds during the harvest season about 10,000 Polish Catholics. Lutheranism is the religion of the three kingdoms. Since 1849 in Denmark, and since 1860 in Norway, liberty of conscience has been granted to all. On the other hand, it has not yet been formally proclaimed in the Swedish Constitution. But although not technically adopted in the laws, it is to a large extent admitted in practise. Even Religious orders are allowed to develop without any obstacle from the Government. There is a Vicar-Apostolic in Sweden, Bishop Bither, one also in Denmark, a veteran 86 years old, Bishop von Euch. The Vicar-Apostolic of Norway is Bishop Fallize, also quite advanced in years. Catholics should be grateful to these apostolic men, who in spite of countless difficulties have gallantly toiled to spread the Faith in these northern lands. In Sweden, Bishop Bither has only 15 priests and 17 churches; Bishop von Euch, in Den-

mark, 47 priests and 33 churches; in Norway, Bishop Fallize counts 24 priests and 16 churches. The Catholic missions of Scandinavia reach as far as the Feroë Islands and Iceland. In the latter country there are only 27 Catholics. The Sisters of Saint Joseph of Chambéry have a flourishing school and hospital, both largely patronized by Protestants. The Danish colony in Greenland has no Catholics. Since 1913 the Island of Spitzberg has been in the Vicariate Apostolic of Norway.

Spain.—Premier Dato was assassinated on the evening of March 8 while returning from the Chamber of Deputies in his motor car. He was attacked by several

**Death of
Premier Dato**

persons who fired a number of shots. The actual assassin of the Premier was a man on a motorcycle: he managed to escape. The Minister died a few moments after the attack. His chauffeur was also killed. It is generally supposed that the assassin was one of a band of extreme radicals, who of late were greatly incensed against the Premier for the stern measures he had taken in the case of the labor revolt.

Eduardo Dato was recognized as one of the most conservative among Spanish statesmen. After the disappearance of Canovas, he became leader of the Liberal-Conservative party in the Senate and the Lower House. He was generally painted as unfriendly to measures of reform and to what he considered the unwarranted demands of the working classes. He owed much of his reputation for sternness to the methods he adopted in 1917 in repressing the workers' movement. He was born in Coruña in 1856, the son of farmer folk, was educated in the schools of Madrid and studied law in the university there. He was admitted to the bar in 1875, and soon acquired the reputation of being one of the best lawyers in the country. He was the author of a well-known history of jurisprudence. He was elected Deputy in 1884 from a district in the Province of Leon, and re-elected from the same constituency in 1891, 1893, 1898. At this stage of his career, he was a follower of Canovas del Castillo, who then was at the head of the Conservative party. But he broke away from his old leader, when in 1898 Francisco Silvela founded the party of the *Union Conservadora*, during the crisis which followed the war with the United States. Although no great admirer of the latter country, he gave his support to the treaty of Paris which terminated the Spanish-American war, and in the Cortes bitterly arraigned Sagasta for not averting the conflict. After the overthrow of the Sagasta Cabinet in 1899, Premier Silvela appointed Dato Minister of the Interior. In the controversies which took place between the Spanish Government and the Vatican, Silvela and his Minister of the Interior fought for the rights and privileges of the Papacy. In 1913, when Antonio Maura, several times Premier, declined to head the Government, King Alfonso offered the post to Señor Dato, who accepted. Always a warm admirer of France, he outlined a policy of open cordiality towards her.

Bolshevism in Schools

ANTHONY J. BECK

ONE of the objects of the movement for the restriction of immigration is the exclusion of radical aliens, especially Bolshevik agitators. Until recently Bolshevism was considered mostly an exotic poisonous weed. Officials and the dominant press seemed to act on the principle that by deporting some shiploads of anarchist agitators and by wholesale raids they could effectively ban the menace of Bolshevism from our country and its institutions.

Fortunately, certain agencies are finally directing attention to the anarchists and their allies within our gates. A recent press dispatch from Washington quoted Henry F. Ryan of Boston, chairman of the Americanism committee of the American Legion, as declaring that there are 8,000 disloyal teachers in educational institutions in the United States. "Agitation against the street corner speaker," said Mr. Ryan, "is useless while school children are being taught by disloyal teachers." He estimated that 2,000 of these teachers are engaged in colleges and universities. Something over a year ago a leading secular daily newspaper stated that there are 8,000 professed radicals on the teaching staffs of high schools, colleges, and universities.

Perhaps this number is too high, as the term, radical, has come to cover a multitude of things and has been rather loosely applied by reactionary interests, profiteers, and "patrioteers" intent on defending a liberalistic system of economics and eager to suppress any movement aiming at a change, no matter how constructive and constitutional. Nevertheless, some schools do harbor not only well-known radicals teaching Bolshevik doctrines, but also hundreds of persons rearing incipient anarchists. In some respects the latter class of teachers is even more dangerous than the outspoken Communists and I. W. W. agitators, for they indirectly but none the less effectively pave the way for Bolshevism.

Though originally meaning rule of the majority, Bolshevism has become a byword for a most subversive form of radicalism. It has come to signify a movement aiming at the forcible overthrow of all lawful government and particularly Christian social order. Satan is the original and most vicious Bolshevik. Before the dawn of human history he smuggled revolution into paradise, one which has had a bearing on every anarchistic movement down to our day. Glancing over the pages of history, you find a long list of abettors—atheists, heretics, and false philosophers from Julian the Apostate to Robespierre and Rousseau, Heine and Haeckel, Huxley and Spencer, Ingersoll and Haywood. There are various classes of Bolsheviks—direct-action and indirect-action "reds"; professional and disguised; brutal and refined; wild-eyed, bomb-throwing individuals and lily-fingered,

oily-tongued gentlemen; social, political, and religious Bolsheviks.

Some Bolsheviks use chemical explosives and operate against officials and public buildings; others employ intellectual dynamite and operate in the press and in schools. The former aim directly at the overthrow of human government; the latter strike at something more fundamental, at God's dominion over mankind, the basis of all law and order. All legitimate government among men is based on the natural and Divine law. "There is no power," says St. Paul, "but from God. . . ." (Romans XIII, 1). Consequently he who preaches or promotes infidelity strikes at the root of all lawful civil authority. He may wear a silk hat and move in polite society; but, if he promotes irreligion, he is, nevertheless, an incipient Bolshevik. "Only too well," declare the Archbishops and Bishops in their joint pastoral letter of February 22, 1920, "does experience show that when religion is banished, human authority totters to its fall." The alternative to banishing God from social and political life, add the Bishops, "is that supremacy of force against which humanity protests."

Those who reject God's rule over mankind will, if consistent in their folly, treat every human authority as a fraud and imposition. Unfortunately, bandits and criminals of all kinds in ever-increasing numbers are practising this suicidal consistency. They are merely applying in every-day life the pernicious principles propagated by disguised anarchists in schools, the press, and theaters. "The modern world," writes Bishop Brossart of Covington, Ky., "is built without God, who was gradually banished from the school and the home, and in consequence, we are menaced by an insane anarchy more destructive than the world war itself."

When Bolshevik historians undertake the task of tracing the history of their movement to its first "rosy-fingered dawn" in another period [observes the *Christian Science Monitor*, Jan. 14, 1920], they may select for its "morning-star" William Godwin, who in the days of the French Revolution was busy evolving his so-called "new philosophy" in the book, "Political Justice." This book, according to Professor Saintsbury, is one of the first in any language to advocate complete reversal, or at any rate removal, of all hitherto accepted principles of law in politics, religion, and morals.

These subversive principles and theories of life have been permitted to creep into thousands of schools and millions of homes by virtue of the absence of positive Christian teaching. Neutrality in religion and morals is as much of a chimera as perpetual motion. Christ said: "Who is not with Me is against Me." More than half of the 110,000,000 people of our country do not take the trouble even to register adherence to any sect or

Church. For their own sake and that of our dear country, we entertain the charitable hope that many of these 60,000,000 of people still believe in a personal God. But how little can we expect from the fathers and mothers among them in the way of that systematic and positive moral training which is necessary to rear children as law-abiding, Christian citizens? Think of the frequent lapses from virtue even among the youth blessed with regular Christian training! What must be said of the schools in which a mere mention of God and the Decalogue is a rare occurrence!

In a recent address at St. Louis, Mo., a sociologist from Chicago deplored the wave of crime sweeping over the country, and pleaded for *new* ideals to keep the feet of the young in the paths of rectitude. Commenting on the lecture, the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* (December 20, 1920) pertinently observed that we do not require new ideals. "What we supremely need is to get back to and cherish the old ones which emanated from Galilee." "Let us get back to 'normalcy' in the matter of the right foundation for the individual character." This foundation can only be laid in the right instruction, which "should be given at home primarily and after that in the public school, the religious school, the private school, the college, the university. . . ."

Instead of helping to construct this foundation, not a few institutions of higher learning have actually encouraged sapping of the pillars of Christian citizenship. Ten years ago Harold Bolce spent several weeks in attending lectures in one after another of more than a hundred universities and colleges. He thus summed up his experiences in the *Cosmopolitan Magazine* (1910):

In hundreds of classrooms it is being taught daily that the Decalogue is no more sacred than a syllabus; that the home as an institution is doomed; that there are no absolute evils; that immorality is simply an act in contradiction of society's standards; that democracy is a failure and the Declaration of Independence only spectacular rhetoric; that the change from one religion to another is like getting a new hat; that moral precepts are passing shibboleths; that conceptions of right and wrong are as unstable as styles of dress; that wide stairways are open between social levels, but that to the climber children are incumbrances; that the sole effect of prolificacy is to fill tiny graves; and that there can be and are holier alliances without the marriage bond than within it.

It may be objected that Bolce's revelations were published when "muck-raking" was a profitable fad of magazines. If only half of his charges are based on facts, the situation is still terrible. In ten years we have seen no thorough refutation of his survey. If his findings are entirely false, how can we explain the rapid invasion of colleges and universities by Socialism, a system of thought which cannot live in a Christian atmosphere, for did not Bebel, one of its founders, declare that Socialism and Christianity are as antagonistic as fire and water? The departments of sociology in not a few universities have for more than a decade inoculated their students with materialistic theories, the broad gateway to Social-

ism. And Socialism is merely the vestibule to Bolshevism; or conversely, in the words of a wag, Bolshevism is "Socialism with whiskers." Scott Nearing, the noted Socialist writer, first came into prominence as a member of the faculty of the Wharton School of Finance at the University of Pennsylvania. He propagated Socialism and made war on motherhood until his attacks on capital became too interesting, about 1915, when he was dismissed. But during his incumbency the attendance had risen from 700 to 1,700 students.

Up to the spring of 1916 the Intercollegiate Socialist Society had organized chapters in seventy-one universities and colleges. Fourteen alumni chapters were established in centers of population ("Bolshevism: Its Cure," by David Goldstein and M. M. Avery, p. 214). From 1915 to 1916 John Spargo, Rose Pastor Stokes, and Harry Laidler delivered addresses in 120 colleges to 30,000 students and to 12,000 other persons. When Mr. Spargo in May, 1917, resigned from the Socialist party because it had become "too radical," he made this announcement: "Through the Intercollegiate Socialist Society and such other channels as are open to me, free from Socialist party control, I shall continue to expound Socialist principles, as I have done for many years past."

During the war Socialism was in bad odor. The less thorough-going Socialist writers and chiefs moulted and put on patriotic finery to meet the approval of the capitalistic press. Educational institutions severed connections with the movement or turned a cold shoulder to its advocates. But as long as they do not fumigate their classrooms with the candles of positive Christian thought their efforts have only a superficial effect. These institutions remind one of a gardener who, instead of pulling out the weeds by the roots, trims them a little and lets them grow again. The same may be said of newspapers, magazines, novels, theatricals, and photoplays. They may even hold up Socialism to ridicule or denounce it in scathing terms. As long as their tendency is to foster so-called "neutrality" toward religion and to foster absolute license of thought on moral questions, they cultivate the soil in which Socialism grows like the proverbial bay-tree. Not every infidel is an anarchist, but an anarchist who believes in God is as rare as a bumble bee in Lapland. When men encourage disloyalty to God they promote treason to lawful government and Christian democracy, the bedrock on which rests genuine Americanism. Efforts at Americanization which do not combat the fundamental evil of irreligion are fraught with little permanent, thorough-going success. The teaching of the language of our country, reduction of illiteracy to a minimum, utilization of alien tongues in the case of immigrants too far advanced in years to speak English fluently, and instruction in the methods and machinery of our form of government—all these are important additions to the superstructure of citizenship. But they can never take the place of a foundation, and if this superstructure is not grounded in a Christian view of life

and loyalty to God, it becomes a makeshift, a leaning tower based on the quicksands of sentiment and passing material interests offering no guarantee of genuine Americanization.

Truman Talley, the "World's Work," the Pope

GEORGE FOSTER

ON February 19 AMERICA took issue with one Truman Talley, who, writing in the *World's Work* of January, 1921, pretended to quote the very words of a Papal decree to the effect "that conscription was immoral and should be resisted." AMERICA pointed out that the Pope never uttered these words, never gave expression to these sentiments. Indeed, the document with which Mr. Talley pretends such intimate familiarity does not even exist.

But Mr. Talley returns to the charge in a statement sent to subscribers to the above mentioned review. In his answer he pleads technical error and asserts substantial accuracy, for, after all, the Irish Hierarchy issued an edict (*sic*) stating "compulsory military service is immoral and should be resisted." And, of course, that such an edict (*sic*) could have been issued by the Maynooth Hierarchy (*sic*) without the advice and even consent of Rome is a theory (*sic*) too thin to be credited, and it is not credited by any chronicler of contemporary times except, of course, certain Sinn Feiners."

Unfortunately for Mr. Talley his defense is as untrue as his first misstatement. Just as he pretended to quote the very words of the Pope in his original article, so now he pretends to quote the very words of the Irish Hierarchy on conscription. It so happens, however, that no such words occur in any communication issued by the aforesaid Hierarchy. What has Mr. Talley to say to this? Once again he pretends to quote exactly words that were never uttered or written in order to fasten an odious charge on a distinguished, patriotic body of men. Ordinarily this is considered a serious matter, at least, by upright people. Further, and worse, the Irish Hierarchy said nothing at all about the morality of *conscription itself*, yet Mr. Talley claims that they did pass judgment on this subject, and pretends, moreover, to quote their very words. And in order to impress the casual reader, he declares his or somebody else's myth "a matter of history." What does the *World's Work* think of this?

Three statements on conscription were issued by the Irish Hierarchy. The first was put out by the standing committee, in the name of the whole Hierarchy, on Tuesday, April 10, 1918. In this there is nothing that can even be twisted into Mr. Talley's words or idea. The second was issued from Maynooth by all the Bishops, on April 18, 1918. This is concerned with compulsory conscription only, with conscription *to be enforced against the will of the Irish nation and in defiance of the protests of its leaders*. Neither does this statement con-

tain the words that Mr. Talley pretends to quote, nor yet the gross idea he attempts to convey. It simply announces the perfectly sound, democratic principle that under the circumstances then existing the Bishops considered "*conscription forced in this way upon Ireland*" an oppressive and inhuman law that might be resisted by all the means consonant with the law of God. What then of Mr. Talley's charge which logically comes to this: that the Hierarchy used either a universal or indefinite proposition pronouncing compulsory conscription immoral, whereas, in reality, the Bishop used a singular proposition calling not compulsory conscription itself, but a definite conscription to be forced in a definite, illegal way upon a definite nation, *oppressive and inhuman*. As every intelligent person will see at a glance there is all the difference in the world between the statement of the Irish Hierarchy and the words Mr. Talley pretends to quote from the statement, just as there is all the difference in the world between the conscription voted by a majority of a nation for itself and conscription forced on a nation without the consent of the people of that nation.

The Bishops' third announcement on conscription was issued from Maynooth on the same day that the second was sent out. In view of the false ethics contained in Mr. Talley's charge it is needless to say that this last announcement does not contain Mr. Talley's pretended quotation. The statement simply denies *the right of the British Government to enforce compulsory service in Ireland*.

So far then Mr. Talley is one hundred per cent wrong in his charge against the Pope, and one hundred per cent wrong in his puerile defense of his patent, substantial error. The Pope did not decree that conscription is immoral. The Irish Bishops did not say that compulsory conscription is immoral. Mr. Talley said so and then tried to fasten his own error on exalted people.

After that he invoked Australia and Quebec in a fruitless attempt to support his own tottering footsteps. He writes as follows:

The same thing happened in Australia, under the leadership of Archbishop Mannix, though the Government acted quickly enough to thwart the move. Here again the Vatican countenanced the decree which was issued in the name and on the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, and which, by its very importance, could not have been promulgated without sanction or order of the Papacy. The same thing happened, to a much less marked degree, in other Catholic strongholds, notably Quebec, where church exhortation against "immoral conscription" caused innumerable riots and widespread opposition to military service.

There are more mistakes in this passage than there are full lines. There are seven such lines in Mr. Talley's copy and eight errors. Let us see. Since the *thing* did not happen in Ireland, the *same* thing could not have happened in Australia. Blunder one. Moreover, no such decree or edict (*sic*) as Mr. Talley specifies was issued in Australia. Mistake two. Even had such a document been issued, it could have been promulgated without the

sanction or order or even the knowledge of the Vatican. Blunder three. The Government did not thwart the move (*sic*). Presumably this wretchedly expressed idea means that the Government thwarted the movement against conscription. Conscription was defeated at the polls in Australia in the regular, legitimate, democratic way. Mistake four. Again, since the *thing* did not happen in Ireland and Australia, the *same* thing could not have happened in Quebec. Blunder five. There were no exhortations against *immoral* conscription. Blunder six. Hence exhortations against *immoral* conscription could not have caused innumerable riots. Blunder seven. Finally, conscription went through and was enforced in Quebec. Mistake eight. More blunders than full lines: seven full lines, eight blunders. Mr. Talley is to be congratulated on this "matter of history."

But there are other and more ridiculous items contained in this sentence: (1) "That an edict (*sic*) of such significance should have been issued (2) by the Maynooth Hierarchy (*sic*) without the advice and consent of Rome is a (3) theory (*sic*) too thin to be credited and (4) it is not credited by any chronicler of contemporary times except, of course, certain Sinn Feiners, etc." An examination of this passage will show that Mr. Talley is reckless beyond measure. 1. In the first place Bishops do not issue edicts, but then the word has a high and mighty sound and is, therefore, appealing to a man who is trying to make out a case against the Pope, on a forgery. 2. There is no Maynooth Hierarchy. 3. Hypothesis, not theory, is the proper word. 4. The Pope himself is not a Sinn Feiner and he is moreover a chronicler of contemporary times, yet he declared twice through accredited agents, one of whom was Cardinal Gasparri, that he heard of the Irish Bishops' pronouncements on conscription ten days after they had been issued. Cardinal Logue is not a Sinn Feiner and he, too, is a chronicler of contemporary times, yet he denied that the Pope was in any way responsible for the attitude of the Irish Hierarchy towards conscription. Archbishop Harty of Cashel may or may not be a Sinn Feiner, but, at least, he is a chronicler of contemporary times and he declared that the Pope had absolutely nothing to do with the Bishops' action on conscription. Mr. Talley's universal negative proposition that no chronicler of contemporary times, except a Sinn Feiner, believes that the Irish Bishops acted without the advice or even consent of Rome is proved false by the testimony of the Pope himself, and by that, also, of two distinguished Archbishops.

In view of Mr. Talley's achievements so far, there is scarcely need of further evidence against him. Perhaps, too, we have been taking him too seriously. Indeed, he seems to have foreseen such an event. And as if to lighten the controversy he ends his long, forced, inaccurate document in the following exquisitely funny fashion:

(1) My statement may have contained a technically "unprovable" phrase, (2) and therefore a technical error, but the technical explanation or correction of it leaves no room for a Cath-

olic to cry "untruth." In trying to avoid circumlocution in making the comparison in the Garvey article more vivid, I may have written too pointedly. (3) The weight of evidence (4) and the consensus of competent opinion, however, incline me to the belief that my precise words are precisely correct (5) though I concede to critics that the Pope may not have, for obvious reasons, publicly claimed the edict for his own. (6) But the responsibility cannot be evaded; (7) no one the least familiar with the workings of the Catholic Church believes for an instant that its hierarchies issue decrees and take steps of such moment solely on their own authority. It simply isn't done and if it is, then the head of the Church must, in the absence of any repudiation, assume the responsibility. At all events, Papal sanction of the decree has not been and cannot be disputed and to date actual Papal origin or authorship, in the face of the almost general acceptance of such an obvious belief, has not been disproved. Some Catholics, though not many Americans of that faith, are distinctly proud of their Church's stand, and just as strongly resent any suggestion that the Church did not see its duty and do it.

It is criminal to spoil such a masterpiece of wit and fancy and theology, but then perhaps by this time Mr. Talley does not care what is said about his skill in controversy or his knowledge of history, ethics and theology. However, even if he does take an examination amiss, it seems imperative to make the following remarks: 1. His original and subsequent statements are substantially, absolutely, and not technically, untrue, as has been proved. 2. Neither Pope nor Bishop said or believed that conscription is immoral. This inference is illogical and childish, for there is no necessary nexus between a technical unprovable phrase (*sic*) and a technical error. 3. There is no evidence either against Pope or Bishop, therefore there is no weight of evidence against either. 4. In this case the consensus of opinion is not against the Pope, if for no other reason, because there is no consensus of opinion in the matter at all. People who know the facts know that the Pope and the Bishops are not guilty of the charge Mr. Talley made against them. The opinions of people who do not know the facts are worth no more than Mr. Talley's opinion. 5. This is an impertinence quite worthy of a person who attempts to base a case on a forgery. 6. The responsibility for Mr. Talley's original and subsequent errors cannot be evaded by him. The Pope has no responsibility in the matter under discussion, unless a false charge based on a forgery and unsupported by even a shred of evidence is a sound proof of guilt. 7. Now Mr. Talley becomes a theologian. Behold him, a layman, and most probably a non-Catholic, striking a pose and passing judgment on a doctrinal matter with a finality that is generally attributed to an ecumenical council in full session. And the actor, forgetting the fable in which the lion's skin played so prominent a part, exclaims:

No one the least familiar with the workings of the Catholic Church believes for an instant that its Hierarchies issue decrees and take steps of such moment solely on their own authority. It simply isn't done and if it is, then the head of the Church must, in the absence of any repudiation, assume the responsibility.

How ruthless Mr. Talley's scholarship is! In one fell sentence or two it robs the great theologians of their laurels. It should have spared the Angel of the Schools, at least, and one or two others. But then history comes to the rescue and in contradiction to Mr. Talley's "It simply isn't done," declares "It has been done," "therefore it is done." An easy solution, to be sure.

Although the writer of these notes spent eight long years as a student of the lore of the schools, philosophical and theological, and five more years as a lecturer and examiner in the schools, yet—in view of the fact that he is about to contradict a layman, apparently a non-

Catholic, a man who probably does not know the first line of the penny catechism—he trembles to say the truth which is this: that the Hierarchies of their respective countries can and do make pronouncements like those of the Irish Bishops on conscription, without the advice, consent, or even knowledge of the Pope. This is Catholic doctrine, this is history. But this is not the point, the point is this: In the January number of the *World's Work* Truman Talley made an absolutely false charge against the Holy Father to the effect that during the war the Pope decreed "that conscription was immoral and should be restricted."

How the Novel Differs from the Drama

AUSTIN O'MALLEY, M.D.

IN the drama as differentiated from the novel an appeal is made to the emotions through the senses directly; in the novel the appeal is made to the emotions through the intellect and imagination by narration; the drama opposes artistic but literal reality to the novel's convention of artistic speech. The dramatist appeals to the ear and eye; the novelist does not. The dramatist reaches our intelligence through the interpretation of the actor; the novelist, through his own power of narration.

There are many realities from the clod you stumble over to the spirituality of the soul; some are understood by infants, others, no whit less real, are understood by God alone. The realities the novel deals with—character, emotion, intrigue, environment, setting, society, physical nature—are those met with in the drama; but in the novel the artist can roam farther afield. He can use supernatural forces, heroic strength, miraculous craft, terrorize an army with the shout of Achilles or Cuchullin, split a Saracen in twain with the axe of Coeur de Lion, while the dramatist is limited to the puny lungs and arms of Coquelin, Booth, Salvini. Hamlet was made fat and scant of breath because Richard Burbage the actor was fat and scant of breath. The dramatist's battle is a half dozen harmless popguns in the hands of recurring supernumeraries, but the novelist can marshal all the million trampling hoofs of Asia. The stage thunders with rolled shot and rattled sheet-iron, it snows with chopped paper, but the novel can let loose a more plausible hurricane or earthquake.

The reader of the novel may review, may study a profound thought, until it becomes his own; the hearer of a play has no time for study: hence the novel may appeal to the intellect more than the drama can. The novel chooses its caste in society; the drama is democratic, it is for the populace as a mass, it must reach the dramatic critic and the girl at a matinee or fail; and because of

this audience the drama is likely to keep the traditional or obvious doctrine, while the novel may be altogether original or recondite.

The novel can produce a far wider view of life than is possible in the three hours' traffic of the stage, supposing equal genius in the novelist and dramatist. Commonly the play selects material almost as simple as that of the short-story, but the novel uses complex elements. It takes at the least two characters to make a drama; contention, action upon a second person, are essential; one character will do for a novel; and she may lie abed throughout the book, or sit in a chair, for the "Portrait of a Lady."

The novelist may partly explain his characters and deeds; the dramatist cannot avail himself of this method of expression. Dramatic characters unfold themselves solely by action and speech used to further the action, and they must be kept together plausibly. The novelist's characters may be left hanging by the neck while he himself is explaining them. Much explanation is a fault in the novelist, but not a little is permissible. "Wilhelm Meister" has too much exposition, "Middlemarch" is even worse. The drama, then, characterizes by action, the novel by action and exposition. The dramatist, however uses speech and action at times in a manner resembling mere exposition: the dagger-vision and the subjective apparition of Banquo in "Macbeth" do not so much advance the action as disclose the state of Macbeth's soul; and the very striking situation in "Hamlet" where the ghost appears to Hamlet in the Queen's room resembles closely the apparition of Banquo in expository qualities. Tragedy in low life is improbable in the drama, because the poetic eloquence of tragedy is not natural in the ignorant; in the novel, however, this limitation as far as eloquence alone is concerned does not exist, since the writer himself may speak.

In the drama, owing to its narrow space, character

cannot be drawn in detail to the extent possible in the novel, even when the dramatist is helped out by the actor's interpretation. The drama illustrates character, as the clever painter does, by a few suggestive strokes, rather than solidifies it. The mere outline sketch of a character in the drama may, of course, be immeasurably more valuable than the detailed work of the novel because of superior strength in a given dramatist over the novelist compared with him, but that is not the point at issue. If the drama is a comedy, the characters are drawn more faintly than in a serious play. Comic characters are usually types, examples of a certain class, rather than individuals; they are exaggerated, caricatures, and the actual man in them is relatively a minor quantity. Even in Molière's work, the most highly developed comedy, this holds true. At best the character with him nourishes the comic quality; as Coleridge said, is a basis for it.

The comic character seems to grow, to be alive, because its absurdity increases. This foolishness stops short only of painful retribution, which would spoil the comic effect. It is enhanced by contrast with rational men and women. Moreover, pity, indignation, and similar emotions, which are contrary to comedy, are excluded. This need not hold for the novel, where a broader life may be depicted. In a novel also we may approach closer to horror than in a drama, because the novelist's concreteness is not so vital as the dramatist's in this respect.

The novel and the romance do not rise to the imaginative heights reached by tragedy as a rule; they do not consider beauty as their chief aim, although there seems to be no intrinsic reason why the romance might not do so; but without such an end in view the highest art is not attainable. The supereminence of the drama lies in itself rather than in the fact that the great dramatists have been more powerful artists than the novelists. Tragedy is poetry, and as such it supposes thought, deed, and emotion which naturally require musical expression, thus adding an artistic grace possible only in a low degree to prose. The best prose has a rhythmic vibration which goes no farther than heat; poetry is a rhythmic vibration intense enough to burst into flame.

The historical novel, or better romance, properly begins in England with Walter Scott, although there were a few such books written before his time; and the Shakespearean historical plays may be taken as the exemplar of the use of historical material in modern fiction. This species of romance is the record of a fictitious individual's life in a setting not so much of actual history as of facts, manners, costumes, forms of speech, opinions, and the like, taken from the pages of history with more or less accuracy, and composed into the unity of a fictitious plot.

The greatest error made in judging the historical romance is to appraise it as history, and not as romance. We take "Macbeth" very seriously as one of the great tragedies of the world, while the real history in it does not go far beyond the names of Macbeth, Duncan, Malcolm, and Siward. There really was a Gaelic king named

Macbeth in Scotland, who reigned from 1040 to 1057, and he probably murdered his predecessor Duncan, although there is ground for the assertion that Duncan was killed in battle; Macbeth was killed at Lumphanan in August, 1057, three years after the Battle of Dunsinane, where Shakespeare had him killed by Macduff, and so on. The main outline of the story as Shakespeare has it is taken from Holinshed's "History of Scotland," but adapted. Shakespeare's character Macbeth has no more possible resemblance to the original Gaelic chief than the uniform of an English major-general, in which one of the old actors used to play the part, has to the costume worn in the Highlands in 1040. This inaccuracy does not affect the tragedy as a work of art.

Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, the man, is a greater distortion of historical truth than Macbeth is, because in Macbeth the poet relied on imagination alone, but in Caesar he wilfully changed the character to justify the deeds of Brutus. Caesar was well known in Shakespeare's time. Ben Jonson's "Sejanus" and "Catiline" kept close to Roman history; they use the very words of Tacitus, Suetonius, and Sallust. True, the result was puppets carved and stuffed according to the descriptions, but he knew the descriptions. Shakespeare availed himself of history as a poet follows a verse-form, to say what he likes while observing the rhyme-sequences, and created living men and women.

If the historical romance in drama or novel is a good interesting romance, a fig for your history! Does Michelangelo's Moses in San Pietro in Vincoli resemble the actual Moses more than it resembles Zeus, and is the statue any the worse for not being a photograph? Shakespeare and Walter Scott never made the slightest claim to the title of historian; they found men and deeds in history, or what passed for history, that suggested romances, and they gave us the romances. We should be grateful for the gift instead of airing cheap pedantry. If, as in "Henry Esmond," the novelist can impart to the inexperienced an illusion of historical accuracy, so much the better, but we should in any case look to the fiction, not to the fact. The best history, anyhow, is no nearer the truth than "Anna Karenina" or "Vanity Fair."

History is sometimes supposed to be a reproduction of the life of a past century, but it is not. It is a record of parts of battles, fragments of politics, occasional deeds of kings and pontiffs in public and private, surveys of frontiers, transcriptions from ledgers, dust, bones; and twenty historians will give twenty different descriptions of the dust and bones. A few centuries from now the documents will make Kaiser Wilhelm I the victor in the Franco-German War of 1870, and he was a harmless old man who could not be a victor in a game of golf. Whenever an historian paints a picture, makes us see a living man or woman, we admire his skill in fiction, but we lose confidence in him as an historian. Imagination is almost as much out of place in history as in physical science, but essential in a drama or novel.

History is not a record of human life in past centuries, but only of the circumstances of life. Human life has no past; it is an unchanging thing, lasting forever. Man's clothing, vehicles, and knowledge of the environment change, but Aristotle knew more of human life than you or I do, and the life he knew was the life of today. There were believers and unbelievers then as now, saints and sinners, wise and foolish, and so on through all the categories. The talk we hear daily concerning the advancement of human thought is misleading. Human thought advances in a knowledge of the material surroundings of man's soul. We do not know the soul itself

as well as the medieval philosophers knew it. Modern psychology is a study of nervous physiology to the neglect of psychology. The only psychologists in the world now, outside the Scholastics, are the novelists and dramatists, and they are not so numerous as to cause crowding. If, then, you would write a drama or novel of the tenth century take a man of today (that is the difficult part), dress him in clothing from the Bayeux tapestry, prevent him from talking of telephones, let him play at hawking instead of bridge, handle a broadsword instead of a rifle, and you have your historical play or novel, whichever you please to write.

The Twelve-Hour Day in Steel

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.

THE production of steel is necessarily a continuous industry. The metal cannot be allowed to cool as it passes from one process to another. The great furnaces must be kept at blazing heat through all the twenty-four hours of the complete day. The question in regard to labor is solely whether the crews that succeed each other should be divided into two, with a working schedule of twelve hours, or into three, with an eight-hour day. The former method was traditional in the steel industry since the invention of the Bessemer process, over sixty years ago. Today this system, known as the two-shift, has been abandoned throughout practically the entire world, with the exception of the United States Steel Corporation and a few large American "independents." The former, according to a special number of the *Survey* for March 5, is now considering the adoption of the eight-hour system.

The usual division of time in the two-shift was an eleven-hour day one week and a thirteen-hour night the next, for the same crew. In many instances the change of shift was accompanied by twenty-four hours of continuous labor once every two weeks, or of eighteen hours once in each week. To this evident excess of toil was frequently added the seven-day week. We wonder, indeed, how it was possible for human beings to endure this strain. The fact is that the saying became proverbial among the men in the steel business that a worker is old at forty.

The existence of these conditions in the United States Steel Corporation attracted the public attention as early as 1911. A committee of the stockholders themselves, to which we shall later return, strongly condemned both the twelve-hour day and the seven-day week in a report made in 1912. No action was then taken, and at the breaking out of the steel strike the subject again leaped into sudden prominence. Discussion of the eight-hour day had almost died out in other industries for want of opposition to the plan. Announcement, therefore, of the twelve-

hour day in the Steel Corporation was met with almost incredulous surprise. Twelve hours appeared a startling anachronism at the present stage of industrial development. The situation can best be summed up in the exclamation of the English steel "hand" when first reliably informed of these conditions in the United States:

No! Wot! Twelve hours and no time out for breakfast or dinner! In America? And seven days a week! Well! Rule Britannia! I supposed we was bloody well the lawst! Blime, yer don't sye!

From the Christian point of view no one doubtless will attempt to defend the twelve-hour day in the manufacturing processes of the steel industry. They represent the most exhausting labor in each of their progressive stages: whether at the blast furnace, where the ore is converted into pig iron; or at the open-hearth and in the Bessemer departments, where the flaming metal is transformed into steel; or in the great rolling mills, where the workers toil and sweat, striving to keep pace with the machines, piling up the sheets of steel, and drawing out into beams and rails the blazing ingots, fearfully fascinating in their dazzling brilliancy; or finally in the various mechanical sections, where a host of expert craftsmen give their constant care to the mighty engines of industry. Ever and anon the scene is varied as the shifts of human beings come and go, like ebb and tide of a restless sea, swirling around among those giant cliffs of huge steel structures. Even so distant and limited an acquaintance with the mills as the first sight of their fierce red glare cast on the nocturnal sky will convince us that it is no child's play in which those tens of thousands are engaged.

It must not, however, be thought that the stockholders of the United States Steel Corporation were unaffected by these considerations. The opposition against the twelve-hour day and the seven-day week was earnestly endorsed by them when the report of their committee, to which reference has already been made, was handed

in at their annual meeting in 1912. It must further be noted that the blame for introducing these inhuman methods did not rest upon them. They were an inheritance from the subsidiary companies. In this regard it is curious to note that Carnegie himself declared that the twelve-hour day must go. Yet in August, 1919, sixty-five out of every hundred men in the company founded by him and bearing his name were still employed on a twelve-hour day. The general average of two-shift men in the manufacturing process of the entire corporation at this date was only a trifle less than forty per cent, or a grand total of no fewer than 66,711. Such were the figures officially given to Mr. John A. Fitch, director of the steel investigation for the Cabot Fund.

All who have even casually studied the history of this corporation are familiar with the comment passed upon the twelve-hour day by the committee appointed from among its own stockholders at the meeting of April 17, 1911, to which I have already referred. Included in that body were a noted financier, a railway president, a stock broker and a famous old Carnegie steel man. A passage in their report has deservedly become classic in industrial literature. They unhesitatingly declared:

We are of opinion that a twelve-hour day of labor, followed continuously by any group of men for a considerable number of years, means a decreasing of the efficiency and lessening of the vigor and virility of such men. The question should be considered from a social as well as from a physical point of view. When it is remembered that the twelve hours a day to the man in the mills means approximately thirteen hours away from his home and family, not for one day but for all the working days, it leaves but scant time for self-improvement, for companionship with his family, for recreation and leisure.

The report was accepted by their fellow-stockholders and referred to a Finance Committee. Of this more later. Commenting favorably on the above passage, the former First Vice-President of the United States Steel Corporation, William B. Dickson, wrote in the *Survey* for January 3, 1914: "I heartily endorse this opinion and will further state that, in my judgment, a large proportion of the steel workers who, from early manhood, work twelve hours a day, are old men at forty." It is the very judgment the men themselves have passed. As for the seven-day week, the same committee reported:

Whether viewed from a physical, social, or moral point of view, we believe the seven-day week is detrimental to those engaged in it. . . . We are strongly of the opinion that no matter what alleged difficulties in operation may seem to hinder the abandonment of the seven-day, they must be met.

For a condemnation, therefore, of the twelve-hour day and the seven-day week it is needless to turn to the Labor Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII or to the verdict of the popular conscience in the matter. The stockholders of the United States Steel Corporation have themselves spoken the last word. Again, to confute the argument that the men desire these conditions we need but turn to the answer made by the same former first vice-president

of the corporation in the article already alluded to. He says:

The plea has been made that in some cases the workmen do not desire a shorter work day. This statement was made as an excuse for the seven-day week, but in both cases it has come from that migratory class of laborers whose sole aim is quickly to accumulate some money and return to Europe, and who, in order to do so, are willing to live and work under conditions which are physically, mentally and morally debilitating. It is not reasonable to permit this class to fix standards for American citizens.

Thus is the Ajax of all the arguments for the twelve-hour day and the seven-day week laid low at one fell blow from this outspoken representative of steel interests. But the great strike of 1919 clearly demonstrated that the men themselves did not want these conditions. "It's slavery and persecution, mill work is. It's a prison." Thus one of the laborers briefly summed up the situation. "It's against the Constitution. It's against the Constitution to work a man so he can't live. What right has any one to go against God's law by making slaves of human beings? A man could live twice as long if he had the eight-hour day." That is as labor sees it, and who will say that labor is not right in this contention? If the Steel Corporation does not abolish the twelve-hour day and the seven-day week, the *State must do it*.

We have heard of the steel worker whose seven-year-old daughter died and he bemoaned that he had not had time to know his own child. The same unnatural state existed in the garment trade. Here is how the Yiddish poet, Morris Rosenfeld, for long years a worker in the sweatshops of London and New York, describes a similar condition in his terrible poem, "My Boy." Something at least of the poignancy of the original is conveyed in this prose translation:

I have a little boy, a fine little fellow is he! When I see him it appears to me the whole world is mine.

Only rarely, rarely I see him, my pretty little son, when he is awake; I find him always asleep, I see him only at night.

My work drives me out early and brings me home late; O, my own flesh is a stranger to me; O, strange to me the glances of my child!

I come home in anguish and shrouded in darkness—my pale wife tells how nicely the child plays. . . .

I stand by the cradle.

I stand in pain and anguish and bitterness, and I think: "When you awake some day, my child, you will find me no more."

Steel laborer or garment worker—there is the human side of it all! In both we meet with the same realization that human life is being ruthlessly destroyed through overwork. "Is it not allowed to rest even one day in the week?" is the beginning of the Yiddish writer's poem, fitly called, "Despair." And he describes the chronic weariness that finally takes hold of the twelve-hour worker, whether in steel or cloth, when he says of his return to the day's toil:

I drag myself, ailing and aching,
Again to the gloom of the shop.

But how was it possible, since stockholders and workers were in such perfect accord in their condemnation of this pernicious system, that it could, nevertheless, continue through all these years in the great Steel Corporation? Even its Finance Committee, to which in 1912 the subject was referred, did not question the truth of anything that has here been said, but merely argued, in its report of 1913, that a three-shift could not be introduced unless competitors, too, were to adopt the same system. This argument can no longer stand. France, England, Germany, Italy, Spain and other European countries have adopted the three-shift system, or eight-hour day in steel. Even in Japan, noted for long hours, it is now declared to be the prevailing tendency in this industry. About twenty independent American companies, representing about forty per cent of the steel industry in the United States, have also successfully adopted it. The details are given in Mr. Drury's expert testimony. They have found it possible not merely to take on an extra crew, but to offer the eight-hour day often with comparatively slight deductions in pay. It has even happened that, with a bonus taken into account, there has been no decrease at all in wages, owing to the greater efficiency of the men. More significant still is the statement made by S. Adele Shaw:

With the hourly wage-rate ranging from an increase of ten per cent in the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, twelve and a half per cent in the National Enameling and Stamping Company, sixteen to twenty-two per cent in the Commonwealth Steel Company, to twenty-five per cent in the International Harvester Company, these eight-hour shift plants, during the labor shortage of last spring, seem to have had not only no greater but, in many cases, considerably less difficulty in securing men than had many of the two-shift concerns. (*Survey*, March 5, 1921, pp. 813, 814.)

Steel workers, certainly, before almost all others have a right to the eight-hour day, the six-day week, and withal a fair living wage according to modern Christian standards, such as will enable them also to provide for the emergencies of the future. No welfare work, no matter how excellently planned—and we fully understand all that the United States Steel Corporation has laudably accomplished in this regard—can take the place of these essentials. If such a course means some sacrifice in profits, then that sacrifice should be cheerfully made. All other difficulties, such as the housing problem, can be equally well solved. The outlay will prove a good investment.

It is the belief of Mr. Drury, the special expert in this field, that three per cent added to the finished product would cover the cost, but that with an increase of twenty-five per cent in hourly wages, thirty-five per cent in labor force, and ten per cent in output, through the efficiency that can be gained, the cost per ton of steel need not increase. Such, too, was Mr. Dickson's conclusion.

In fine, let stockholders and captains of industry remember that the object of industry, in conjunction with

agriculture, is to enable all men to obtain a comfortable livelihood for themselves and for their families in return for a fair day's work. It is not the increased profits of the few but the happiness of the many that must be consulted. Any system that fails to recognize this truth has no reason for existence. The ultimate object of all industry is to enable men to serve God in joy of spirit and to save their eternal souls. From this point of view, the only one a Christian employer or stockholder may ever assume, the two-shift system and the seven-day week stand absolutely condemned. The verdict is: "They must go!"

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six hundred words

The Flag of the United States

To the Editor of AMERICA:

During press hour last Sunday we were surprised to read in the interesting article, "When Kossuth Came to America," in your issue for February 19, that the thirteen stripes were first unfurled at the battle of Bunker Hill, and that it was on that occasion that the flag first waved in triumph. Does Mr. Barton refer to the flag of our country? This does not seem to be the case, because the battle of Bunker Hill was fought June 17, 1775, and the flag of the United States was not adopted by Congress until June, 1777. Perhaps he refers to the flag that the American Colonists made in 1775, by placing six white stripes on the red field of the commercial flag of England. In this supposition, also, his statement would be incorrect, for we have always understood that this flag was first unfurled by General Washington at Cambridge in January, 1776. We have never heard of its being used at the battle of Bunker Hill. But even if it was used on that occasion, it would not be considered the flag of freedom, as it retained the British Union Jack, the thirteen stripes representing colonial union. The Colonists were then fighting for their rights as colonists; it was not until they began to fight for their independence that the American flag was adopted. This flag was unfurled for the first time at the battle of Fort Stanwix in 1777. The impression conveyed by Mr. Barton's article is that the flag of the United States was first used at the battle of Bunker Hill.

Nazareth, Ky.

T. S. H. C.

American Graves and the Peasants of France

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The historic friendship, which binds America and France, having been newly cemented by the blood of our own boys, must eternally endure. So few of us Americans, however, have actually felt in our lives the sting of the war, that there is danger of our forgetting that for many thousands of our soldiers, the war is not over, nor ever will be. The fact that in our daily experience no sign or trace of the suffering our boys endured or are still enduring, meets our gaze, enables the mind of even the most sympathetic to cease to regard what has happened as of much consequence. In the sweet land of France, where our boys rest so quietly, there is no danger of their being forgotten, for suffering understands suffering.

It is hard for us to realize, that in every part of that region near the battle-line, the havoc of war still continues. A spade can never be stuck in the ground without the possibility of hitting a deeply buried bomb, hand-grenade or torpedo. During January, 1921, at Montzeville, near the world-famed Hill 304, several such accidents occurred; a cow slips in a hole and is blown to atoms; the pick of a workman mending the road hits an un-

exploded bomb, he and a companion expire before aid can reach them. A young man just married, fencing in a bit of pasture, steps on a hidden hand-grenade and has his leg blown off. Then, too, there are the discomforts of life in thin temporary barracks, through whose roof the rain drips, and whose wide cracks, caused by shrinkage of unseasoned boards, admit murderous drafts. Life in winter, under these circumstances, is dismal, indeed, especially when to these and numberless other annoyances and sufferings is added a plague of rats and mice, so formidable as to drive the inhabitants almost to despair.

But for people of so heroic a mold as the French there is always a bright side somewhere to be found. In January the people of Montzéville, after untold efforts made by themselves and their good curé, saw their little board chapel begun. Oh, what joy and what rejoicing! Old men and old women, weeping for happiness and saying: "*Enfin, nous ne mourrons pas sans voir notre église!*" Confidently the villagers expect accidents to be less frequent, "*puisque le Bon Dieu est rentré chez nous.*" Moreover, spring is coming; gradually the ground is being cleared of deadly explosives; persistent warfare is lessening the dread pest of vermin; no future winter can ever be so dreary as the one just past. The Curé writes: "Montzéville will count twelve new *foyers* because of marriages; you see there is courage still to live."

But though the outlook for them is brightening a little, we should not, as Americans, forget that always these good people will have near them the graves of the countless dead, among which the snow-white crosses of our American boys will be a perpetual reminder of the age-long friendship of the two nations. Let us pay them at least the homage of our gratitude for that tender solicitude for our dead, which, better than any monument of marble, crowns the work of our boys in France.

Moorestown, N. J.

ELIZABETH S. KILE.

Some Thoughts on Labor Value

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The labor-value discussion seems to have come to an end. I have no desire whatever of entering into the controversy, but I should like to make a suggestion or two which I consider highly important. It seems to me, after careful reading, that a doubt is cast on the justice of capital being put out at interest. This matter has been thoroughly discussed by moralists and the liability firmly established. Again the Socialistic expression, labor value, is obscure because of the different meanings of value and because value itself implies a comparison with something else. The scholastics who use the word "riches" as produced by labor are incomparably clearer. They claim, and rightly, that the producers of riches are labor, nature and capital. It is wrong to say that labor is the only producer of riches. Nature and natural forces play a great part in the production. A crop grows spontaneously on my property. I sell it on sight for a large sum. I have not turned a finger in the transaction. Am I therefore justified in accepting the return? Even after the above principles are admitted, there remains the question: Is labor otherwise entitled to the full value of the product? This discussion I regard as purely speculative; practically the reward of labor till the end of time will be determined by bargaining, either individual or collective, just as it always has been.

New York.

H. A. JUDGE, S.J.

A College Mite-Box

To the Editor of AMERICA:

For the past year I have been experimenting as Prefect of Discipline in Holy Cross with a Foreign Mission Mite-Box, having before me a two-fold purpose: to aid those laboring in the mission field, and to teach the student-body the necessity of assisting in the spread of the Faith by contributions from their own personal resources. A relationship was established

between the mite-box and permission to go to the city or to one's home. On returning from each such diversion, the student was supposed to place in the box, always in view, a trifling coin, at least a penny, though no objections were raised if a larger sum was given. Donations were very liberal, and though pennies predominated, 1,600 of them being found in the first accounting, there were many nickels, dimes, a few quarters, and one half dollar. The boys took great interest in the box and often a student would remind his friend to contribute or borrow the mite in order to make the contribution.

The first penny was deposited in the box at the beginning of Lent last year, and it was originally planned to make the practice a Lenten offering; but the scheme worked so successfully that it was determined to keep up the good work throughout the year. February 28, 1920, was the date when the first contribution was made and the results up to February 28, 1921, one complete year, were most satisfactory, and reveal what can be done by a little perseverance and action. Our total mite-box offering for the missions is the substantial sum of \$222.89, and who can tell the amount of good done for the Church by these free offerings made as a result of home and town permissions by the student-body? This fund has been distributed among the Catholic Foreign Mission Society at Maryknoll, the Techny (Ill.) Mission, the Indian and Negro Missions, the Propagation of the Faith, and the Jesuit Missions in Jamaica, B. W. I.

If a mere mite-box in a prefect of discipline's office at a large college brings in such an amount, as the result of self-imposed toll on permissions to leave the college, what would be the result for our foreign missions if each boarding school followed this plan, either on "out-permissions" or for other concessions granted the students? In high schools, parochial schools, and the like a mite-box would mean a great boon to the missions when contributions to it were freely attached to some daily or weekly function that marks the class-life.

Worcester, Mass.

JOHN D. WHEELER, S.J.

A Prophecy?

To the Editor of AMERICA:

A field of Catholic activity which seems as yet to be slightly cultivated is that of systematized public lectures. Many splendid lectures by Catholic scholars and thinkers are given to small select gatherings. Even when committed to print, they reach a comparatively small circle of readers; truth contained in them fails to reach the great mass of the people including Catholics. The possible results of a great lecture system are worthy of consideration. Phases of such a system have already been given to the public, and, perhaps, to some degree the system is in operation. Time no doubt will witness its speedy development. The sooner the better, if this Christian order of things is to be maintained.

Probably in ten years from now we shall look back on the rise and rapid growth of the public forum. At that time we may record the development as follows: When the great central lecture bureau was established, a new Catholic profession came into existence. Priests and Catholic laymen came to the institution and there received expert training in lecturing. A variety of the fascinating subjects, relating to religion, science, history, sacred and profane, ancient and modern, sociology, and education, each attracted students, and prospective lecturers. Each lecturer, as he became master of his chosen subject and manifested his ability to interest an audience, learned or unlearned, was sent on his lecture tour. Every parish in the country or any society desiring a lecture on any subject, sent an application to the central bureau. The size or location of the parish or town did not determine success in securing a lecturer; for the larger towns made up the financial shortage in the smaller places. When the list of applications was sufficiently filled the lecturer started on his way.

The moving-picture at last was turned to good use and was employed extensively. Every lecturer carried with him his machine and the pictures appropriate for his subject. Country pastors as well as city pastors, occupied though they were, with various duties, could now easily arrange a series of instructive lectures, which at the same time furnished ennobling recreation for their flocks. The people who were formerly left to themselves to choose their own movies, with "don't" as their only direction, now received a positive alternative to the vicious productions.

In a short time a change came over the country. As the rays of sunlight destroy disease germs, the beauty and truth of the Church's teachings began to destroy the hideous things that were creeping about everywhere before the lecturing began. Even bigotry, suspicion and anti-Catholic campaigns were checked as the mass of the people were attracted to the wonderful and inspiring Catholic truths. At last Catholic Christianity has seized the most powerful weapons of the adversary and now stands triumphant. The Church's victory at this time is the greatest since the days of Constantine, etc. In some such way may we write ten years from now.

Side by side with the development of the press, must come the development of the lecture system. By press and platform, the Gospel of Christ must be carried to the multitudes. The days of defense are past. Now for the attack. We belong to the Church Militant. Christ said: "Launch into the deep."

Cantley, Canada.

G. W. O'TOOLE, P. P.

An Unshackled Press

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The Rev. Gerald C. Treacy, S.J., earned the gratitude of every newspaper man by writing the article, "Crusaders in Journalism," that appeared in AMERICA for November 13, 1920.

There have appeared of late years many articles dealing with one or the other phase of the press problem. I have consulted other newspaper men and also students of journalism. None can remember an understanding of the news writer's position in any article before Father Treacy's. He seems to be the first to see and declare that the journalist is not chiefly to blame for the grave misdeeds of the press, that he is more sinned against than sinning.

In all modesty, what Father Treacy says about the splendid qualities of journalists is unadorned truth. I do not mean to say that they are better than other men, but I vehemently maintain that they are as good as other men. And not only I, who am a newspaper man jealous of the honor of his profession, but all who mingle with editors and reporters know that they are, with inevitable exceptions, what this Jesuit writer says they are: full of the idealism of youth, imaginative, sincerely desirous of obeying the ethics of their profession and the ethics of life.

Father Treacy tells why, though this is the character of the mass of journalists, the press is nevertheless what it is. He shows how unscrupulously mercenary, selfish ownership is to blame. But another question is often asked, and deserves an answer. Why is it that these idealistic, enthusiastic, imaginative, decent, straight-thinking, able men do not refuse service to the power that not only pays them niggardly, but shackles them?

Part of the answer is the commonplace fact that men must earn money with which to buy bread for themselves and those dependent on them. Most journalists know, or imagine that they know, no other way of making a living. More and more each year, they are college or university men who enter newspaper work upon graduation, at an age when the average fellow must set about making money without delay. By the time the shackles begin to gall, very many have assumed obliga-

tions, many have reached an age that makes a change difficult or extremely hazardous.

Another part of the answer is the peculiar, almost unique grip in which journalism holds those who give themselves to it. Let editors and reporters realize how venal are the owners. Let their compensation be less than they could command in business or in another profession. There is still something, intangible, vague, even to them, that keeps them at the strenuous but fascinating task. Joyce Kilmer, in his essay on Lafcadio Hearn, calls journalism the most romantic of all the occupations of man. That is a large part of the answer.

And if anyone says that newspaper men who stick to their work in spite of all are foolish; if anyone says such conduct is boyishly sentimental, unworthy of men, let him ask the sailors why they, again and again, go down to the sea in ships. And let him remember that if some men were not governed by inexplicable attractions such as these, much of the work of the world would be left undone, and in the case of the press, conditions would be even worse than they admittedly are. For in so far as they can, newspaper men are resisting the domination of commercial and corrupt interests.

With all my heart I hope journalists will "purify and elevate the American press by uniting in a national body," the "American Newspaper Writers' Association" suggested by Father Treacy. Some preliminary steps have been taken. There are newspaper men's organizations that seek to gain more independence for their members. There is a national professional journalistic Greek letter society that has for one of its aims the putting of newspapers into the hands of newspaper men, not mere money-makers.

Meanwhile, there can be an unshackled press. We Catholics of America can have a press into which "youth, imaginative and idealistic," can pour itself "year after year" and "make itself felt." We Catholics can escape, so far as we ourselves are concerned, the clutches of venal newspaper control. By enlisting the assistance not of a small number of wealthy men, but by forming stock companies and inducing many men to take small amounts of stock, we can have our own papers and prevent one-man domination. And from the Catholic schools of journalism, such as that of Marquette University, Milwaukee, there will come forth each year a company of young men "headed toward newspaperdom." These will have been given "a real live course on newspaper technique" and Catholic principles. These will be the "new crusaders" of whom Father Treacy writes, and they will go to work under the older Catholic journalists, now perforce on other papers, but ready and eager to labor where they will be free to follow the highest ideals of their high calling.

Even if the secular press were not in the control of men who care more for gold than for decency and truth; even if it were in the hands of the fair-minded, sensible and decent-hearted journalists, there would still be weighty reasons why we should have an adequate press of our own, not only monthly and weekly publications, but daily newspapers, the most popular, widely-read form of reading matter in the world today. How much more urgent is it then, in view of the facts in Father Treacy's article and in Upton Sinclair's "Brass Check," that we do not delay in providing for ourselves the right kind of daily reading in our homes, Catholic newspapers that are free and clean!

By maintaining for ourselves a chain of Catholic dailies, one in every community where the number of Catholics and other factors make this practicable, we shall not only acquire for ourselves what we need and cannot get in any other way, we shall be opening a wide new field for the splendid young Catholics who are drawn to journalism, and our heaven will help to leaven the whole mass of the press.

Milwaukee.

ALBERT P. SCHIMBERG.

A M E R I C A

A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

SATURDAY, MARCH 19, 1921

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. GREEN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

What Shall We Do with the Movies?

A GOOD intention is an excellent quality in a legislator. But something more is needed. Nothing can supply for a lack of common sense. Individuals whose intentions are most laudable are now proposing to check the evils of the motion-picture trade by laws which, equivalently, boil all offenders in oil. This procedure would undoubtedly solve the particular offender, but it would not solve the question, "what shall we do with the movies?" One may sympathize with the indignation directed by good men against the traffic in improper pictures, without concurring in the wisdom of their plans to remove the evil. That some censorship is needed is shown by present disgraceful conditions in the trade. But the precise difficulty is to fix upon a censorship which will protect the community from improper productions, without using methods which are either unconstitutional or gravely unjust.

What the manufacturers resent most keenly is "the pre-release censorship." This means that before leaving the factory the film is reviewed by censors who decide whether or not it can be shown to the public. The manufacturers maintain that this kind of censorship is practically a violation of the "freedom to speak and to print" clause of the various State constitutions. This point is well taken. The author of a book is not required to submit his manuscript to State censors, nor the publisher of a newspaper, nor is a speaker compelled to supply the police with an outline of what he intends to say. But all, should they offend against the peace, are to be held responsible, and cannot plead the constitutional guarantee in defense. The moving-picture manufacturers argue that they should not be put under a censorship from which publishers and speakers are free.

This argument cannot be dismissed by an indignant gesture. It has much force, none of which will be lost in its presentation before the courts. An indignant community might compel the pre-release censorship, but the constitutionality of this procedure is at least doubtful. Possibly the manufacturers might be induced to accept

voluntarily what they will fight if imposed by law. There is no doubt that millions of fathers and mothers, resenting the outrageous lengths to which even prominent producers have gone, are preparing to put their resentment into a form which the trade cannot escape without heavy financial losses. After all, no real reform can be secured without the cooperation of the manufacturer and exhibitor. In view of the present state of public opinion, the trade might be led to understand that "voluntary" submission to local pre-release censorship is a wise policy. The public will no longer accept promises. What it now demands is some sign of the trade's intention to clean its house and keep it clean.

Full cooperation with local censorship is the best indication of reform. The exhibitors who have their financial interests at heart will also cooperate with the local authorities to secure the prompt arrest and conviction of the harpies who may be found among them. History is a series of repetitions. The fact that the moving-picture industry represents a huge financial expenditure should induce no false sense of security. The trade in whiskey also involved a capital of millions, but the lawless saloons killed it. The lawless element will also kill the picture-trade. The respectable men in the business must at once take the lead in suppressing the moving-picture's continued attacks on public morality. If they do not, a day of disastrous reckoning is at hand.

Ladies of the Jury!

FEMINISM is one thing and votes for women quite another. A citizen may be an ardent advocate for the extension of the suffrage, and no friend to feminism. In the old days, many a "votes for women" orator based his plea on the possible understatement that women were as good as men. The feminist argument seems to be, on the contrary, that women ought to be quite as bad as men. It is a sad prospect which that philosophy presents. But with the vote secured, a certain element now seems bent on forcing women not only to vote but also to accept jury service. In New York this party has adopted the curious view that to serve on a jury is a precious privilege of which women must not be defrauded.

Jury service is now, of course, a duty rather than a privilege; a real duty, but not a citizen's highest duty. Thus in many States, physicians and clergymen are excused on the ground that by ministering to sick bodies and sick souls, they render a service that is of higher value to the community. On a somewhat similar ground, it would seem well to excuse women. They might be fairer, less sentimental or less rigid, and more judicial in tone, than the general run of men. That is admitted. But they are not men. That also must be admitted. They have duties to the community which they alone can perform. It would seem, too, that there are conditions in this world in which women may not profitably take part, while men may and must, not because women

are better or worse than men, but simply because they are women.

Nobody pleads for an Oriental exclusion of women. Such exclusion has never existed in the English-speaking countries and there is certainly no danger of its introduction in the near future. But there is sound reason back of the sentiment, still fairly general, that women should not place themselves on the same plane in public affairs with men. A Philadelphia judge recently excused all women from a panel on the ground that the charges to be presented by the district attorney contained matter which in his opinion was unfit for them to hear. There is something repugnant in the notion of a woman acting as a public executioner, just as there is something repugnant in the notion of sending a group of women-police to raid an unsavory den, or of forcing a woman to sit in a jury-box to listen to details of shocking crimes. Women may not be purer or gentler or less touched with the world's defilement than men, but the world likes to believe that they are, and to hope they will always be. There is no maudlin sentiment in the preference which every honorable man entertains, that the woman from whose chaste lips his little ones will learn their first ideals of duty to God and to themselves, should be a creature who has not been forced by the law, much less has sought, to come into contact, with a vileness from which he as a decent, clean-living man shrinks with disgust, and accepts only as a duty.

The Hanging of the Crane

THROUGH a syndicated newspaper "box" Doctor Frank Crane daily discourses on a variety of topics. Dr. Crane bears a striking resemblance to O. Henry's Andy Tucker. "I'm all aflame," remarked Andy, after purchasing the only saloon in town, "and crammed inside with an assortment of words and phrases that have got to have an exodus. I can feel millions of synonyms and parts of speech rising in me, and I've got to make a speech of some sort." Whereupon he departed to deliver an harangue on the advantages of total abstinence.

The inflamed Doctor Crane also went out recently to make a speech, not in a pulpit but from a box in a corner of the New York *Globe*, and his subject was not total abstinence. It might have been that, or it might have been a few surface remarks, in his customary style, on the Fourth Dimension, or on evolution, or on the habits of pink rabbits, or on the reason why the giraffe has a long neck. But for some unexplained reason, he chose to discourse on the Smith-Towner bill. "Unexplained" is a picked word, for the result demonstrated that while the venerable Doctor may have read the bill, he was successful to an unparalleled degree in escaping all understanding of what that offshoot of Prussianism means. "Everybody ought to understand and boost it," he advises. Doctor Crane "boosts" it to the best of his ability by a generous assortment of synonyms and parts of speech, but only because he does *not* understand it.

If he understood it, he would probably adopt the attitude of Dr. Hadley, who writes that the chief result of the Smith-Towner system in France and Germany was to make the schools part of a political machine, thereby hindering to the best of that machine's great power, all true progress in education.

The chief point of Doctor Crane's misunderstanding is contained in the monstrous statement that the bill *prohibits* "Federal control of Education within the States." Since the bill puts the control of \$100,000,000 in the hands of the Secretary of Education and directs him to withhold all Federal aid from any State "whensoever *he shall determine* that such apportionment or apportionments made to said State . . . are not being expended *in accordance with the provisions of this act*," a number of facts follow. The first is that the States are required to meet certain educational standards. The second is that these standards are set not by the States but by the Federal Government. The third is that these standards or provisions are interpreted by a political appointee known as the Secretary of Education. And the fourth is that unless these Federal standards are met, and the interpretations of the Federal Secretary accepted, no State may have any share in the annual politico-educational fund of \$100,000,000. If this is not Federal control of the schools within the States, then the word "control" has acquired a meaning which the dictionaries have failed to record.

This argument is not directed to Doctor Crane. Probably he is incapable of understanding it, and in any case, no sensible man is accustomed to take him with any degree of seriousness. Dr. Crane is simply the occasion. Its purpose is to urge all who read, to obtain a copy of the Smith-Towner bill and to study its provisions for the establishment, in this representative democracy, of a scheme of centralized education which Bismarck, that eminent advocate of free institutions, strove to establish in Prussia, but in vain.

The Church the Teacher of Courtesy

"IN European countries the Catholic Church alone inculcates real courtesy," was the conviction of David Urquhart, a Scotch pacifist of the last century, whose remarkable biography has been sympathetically written by Miss Gertrude Robinson. By courtesy, he maintained, a man safeguards his own dignity and shows a proper respect for that of others. "It is the language of love and justice, of national and international peace, law and liberty." After the Vatican Council, on the deliberations of which Mr. Urquhart, though a non-Catholic, exercised a strong influence for good, he interested the Holy Father and the General of the Jesuits in a plan he had to reform the pagan statecraft of Europe by establishing at Rome a diplomatic college designed to correct "the dangerous heresy that religion was an affair of man's own soul and had nothing to do with politics or public affairs." With this end in view, Mr. Urquhart

proposed that the young diplomats of the future should be trained.

First in cleanliness, the real cleanliness of the Turkish bath; then in politeness, the real courtesy of the East, to be found in the West only in the ceremonial of the Catholic Church. "These two un-Western practises would immediately set up a barrier between him and the defiling and irreverent spirit of the age."

Then would come the study of the law of nations; then the study of history, true history, not such as is taught in school or class book, nor that which has been miscalled history for the last 300 years. Last of all the student would learn "metaphysics," beginning with the study of words and their connection with thought, and going on to the connections between thoughts and ideas in the minds of men and nations.

As it is on spoken language and on men's bearing to one another that human society rests, Mr. Urquhart believed that Europe's well-being chiefly depended on the Church's success in teaching the civilized world to be courteous and sincere. It was his delight to study the sanctuary as a school of good manners. He admired, for example, the courtesy shown by the server at Mass as he bowed to the celebrant on offering the cruets. The stately ceremonial of a high liturgical function pleased him, no doubt, even more. For then he could behold the Bishop, the assistant priests, the deacons, acolytes, etc., all moving decorously in their proper orbits, and showing each minister of the Mass the reverence and courtesy his rank or office demanded.

Though Mr. Urquhart, as is the way with extremists,

probably exaggerated the importance of courtesy as the sovereign corrective for the evils of modern statecraft, there is no doubt that the universal spread of that sincere spirit of courtesy, with which the Catholic Church is able to fill the hearts of her most faithful children, would do much to end the hard divorce now existing between "diplomacy" and Christian ethics in the nations of the world. It is because they are so Catholic that the peasants of Ireland and Spain have the considerate manners of true gentlemen. If the sincere courtesy which good Catholics are taught by their religion, and even by the ceremonial, as Mr. Urquhart noted, with pleasure, of the sacred liturgy, were practised by the "civilized" nations in their dealings with one another, there would probably be an immediate and gratifying change in the character of the world's statecraft. But before this highly desirable improvement in international relations could be brought to pass, all our statesmen and diplomats would have to be persuaded and convinced that the Commandments of God and the teachings of Christ are no less binding on individuals than on nations. For true Christian courtesy comes only from sincere Christian hearts. But as long as the pagan principles of deceit, cruelty, selfishness and expediency rule the chancelleries of Europe, that Christian courtesy, which Mr. Urquhart labored so hard to have practised between nations, will scarcely be more than an evanescent dream.

Literature

POETS' POETS

IF a fire, malicious in intent, savage in extent, such as under Nero and Domitian sought to destroy the libraries of post-Augustan Rome, were to sweep down the Main Street repositories of ancient Greek literature, if the texts and translations of the Greek masters were deleted from the world, we could still retain much of the soul of these authors, even if we could not reconstruct their bodies. Lines here and there, like bits of bones from a cave, might be gathered from commentators; and fragments, if the original were as brief as a song by Sappho, might lead to an integral restoration. But what Woolworth, such as Homer is, could be lifted entire from the ruins; could devotion and science restore the artistic "three-deckers" of Sophocles? The craftsman in a side room of the British Museum may fashion with perfect accuracy the replica of a Greek temple, having for his start only a broken plinth and a line of the pediment which the excavating archeologists furnished; but there is no skilled collector, even had he the memory of Macaulay and the linguistic ability of Mezzofanti, who could present a similar achievement in Homer's regard. Yet what parcels, numerous and ample, out of Homer's direct citations and felicitous paraphrases find lodgment in the pages of other literatures.

The spirit, or the vital spark of the spirit of Homer and Sophocles may be discovered in the revivifying appraisements of later poets. And before we advance a worthy illustration or two, and so stand our armor up for proof, let us insist that it is the soul of a great poet, a great soul, and not a mere sentimental spook, which merits perennial resurrection—everlasting, as far as time can carry it. Welcome revisitant is he, both in his own magisterial robes, or come he garbed in the eulogies of

other poets, thinking with them at their firesides, whispering from their balconies, with his spiritual ideals, with his motives for character which transcend in importance anything his bodily lineaments, to wit, his textual integrity, might present. It should be so; and herein the metaphysical critic surpasses the physical anatomist. For the spirituality of ethics takes precedence over the materialistic externals of esthetics. Ethics is the elder sister in the household of art. Esthetics, connoting thereby sensation as the basis of the beautiful, must remain a modest serving maid. "Obedience to law" was written over the gateway to Eden; and though invisible to the bodily eye, it should read across every temple of art, and run like a golden thread through the songs of a great poet, if he propose to have his soul endure, and, in a later day and society, serve other souls. Pausing here, as it were, for a marginal note, let us remark that Francis Thompson elaborated a magnificent eulogy on Shelley's art; he limps and halts and breaks down over his analysis of Shelley's ethical content, or rather over his esthetic void.

Returning then to the line of our text, read the partial roll-call of names that bow with reverent appreciations to Homer and Sophocles. Virgil and Horace, Dante and Keats support the canopy over Homer's triumphant march: Seneca, Corneille, (let us whisper Voltaire), and Matthew Arnold are the goodly escort for Sophocles. Remind me not that Dante, and Keats are ill-chosen, since they were not scholars to the Greek letter. But who shall deny that they knew the spirit, venerated the great soul of the "sovereign poet," as Dante named him, calling him again, "That lord of highest song who soars like an eagle above the others." Keats, too, gave promise of a wonderful cult of the Greek bard, a promise rich in achievement had

time been allowed him. For his first cursory view of those peaks and plains of song, "On First Looking into Chapman's Homer," produced a perennial tribute in that sonnet which rings like a command, "eyes right" towards Homer in every grand review of the master poets. That sonnet, is found, and hereafter shall be, in every true anthology of English poetry. Keats shall be lecturer for Homer in American schools which refuse to recognize the Greek if he enter alone.

"*Vos plaudite!*" say we first in salute of Homer: "*Encore!*" for Keats. And Matthew Arnold ventures to add that Homer, though blind, had greater spaces in his vision than Balboa, whom Keats misnamed Cortez, obtained from the summit of Darien. Homer is for Arnold primarily a guide and support of character, however largely the English critic praised him on other lines, and imitated him in countless pages. The soul of the Greek master was a shield for the disciple in adversity. Witness the verification of this in the question and response of Arnold's quatrain:

Who prop, thou ask'st, in these bad days, my mind?—
He much, the old man, who, clearest-soul'd of men,
Saw the Wide Prospect, and the Asian Fen,
And Tmolus hill, and Smyrna bay, though blind.

Then with a tribute to Epictetus, whom even St. Augustine hailed "the noblest Stoic," Arnold mounts higher and places the chief laurel on the brow of Sophocles, "My special thanks." And who shall venture to stay the gesture, to refute the analysis, or erase a phrase from the encomium? For, below the books of Divine inspiration, beneath the shelf which holds the meditations of Ecclesiastes and Job, what poet-philosopher, poet-theologian of the ancient world may have a space above Sophocles! And if his lyric art could amaze a supreme court in law, as the ode in "*Colonus*" did, if his dramatic genius thrilled and thrilled again a people of exquisite discernment, his ethical content is the soul that endures, and wears, *salva reverentia*, like the Lorica of St. Patrick, for characters who live at least the natural law. It is the spirit of that majestic Greek, more stately than Booth as Ghost to Hamlet, that walks the platform of Arnold's lines:

Whose even-balanced soul,
From first youth tested up to extreme old age,
Business could not make dull, nor passion wild;
Who saw life steadily, and saw it whole;
The mellow glory of the Attic stage,
Singer of sweet *Colonus*, and its child.

We need not go searching for embellishments for this garment which Arnold wove; embroidery is superfluous. Imitators of the Greek, who labored to present the later stage with adaptations of Sophoclean characters,—Seneca, Corneille, Dryden and Voltaire—let them pass with their courtesy. Prophecy in regard of his art, Ovid makes without hazard: "*Nulla Sophocleo veniet factura cothurno.*" Arnold is at one end of the arch of true praise; and at the other is Phrynichus, contemporary of Sophocles, singing of him, as Campbell reports the fragment:

The happy child of sad Melpomene
To whom long life brought no calamity.
To crown his works Genius and Fortune blend,
And Death has sealed them with a peaceful end.

Return we then to the "sovereign poet," to that remote predecessor of Sophocles, to Homer, the seer of "the wide prospect." His soul, gleaming in a hundred places, proves its immortal stuff by an appeal to Horace. Man of the street that he was, courtier and courted, pupil of many modes of Greek verse, Horace the philosopher goes to Homer for a lecture on the ethical quality of great poetry. Note his prescription for worthy poetry: "This was what was meant by Wisdom in old days: to separate the rights of one from the rights of all, divine things from common, to forbid lawless love and prescribe rules of wedded life, to build cities and grave laws on wooden tables."

And with thoughts of Homer before him, with his name ready for use as an illustration, Horace continues, "It was so that

poets sung and their song won the honor and the name of divine. In song oracles were given, and men were guided in the ways of life; the favor of kings was courted in strains learnt of the Muses, and amusement was found to crown the close of long toil." Passing from this "Epistle to the Pisos" to another letter, the second in the first book of Horace's Epistles, hearken to the more direct lecture with Homer for the text. It commands attention not merely for its revelation of the heart and soul of the Iliad and Odyssey, but for its critical skill as well. It urges to the lips a wish that we had such books to review today, and such critics to review them. Homer, the Latin disciple insists, is a book of morals:

While you have been practising in declamation at Rome,
Lollius Maximus, I have been reading again at Praeneste
the story-teller of the Trojan War; who shows us what is
fair, what is foul, what is profitable, what not, more plainly
and better than a Chrysippus or a Crantor.

Stoic preachers, even in conjunction with these two men of that day, could not compare with the truer and more fascinating expression of doctrine found in Homer; his ethics vitalizing his esthetics. And the "digest" which Horace gives runs memorable with lines of the value of accepted proverbs: twenty of them as striking and as comprehensive as these:

*Quidquid delirant reges plectuntur Achivi.
Seditione, dolis, scelere atque libidine et ira
Iliacos intra muros peccatur et extra.*

Let us recommend that an English translation of these run as a mural memento around the chamber of the League of Nations: "For the delirium of Prime Ministers, the people are made to suffer. Faction, craft, wickedness, and the lust and anger from which it springs—these are the sources of wrong-doing within the walls of Troy and beyond them."

Thereupon comes the keen synopsis of the Odyssey, and again the insistent interpretation of the moral value, of the undying soul-attributes of that book. "Again, of the power of virtue and of wisdom, Homer has given us a profitable example in Ulysses." "What are we," Horace intones the solemn question, "but mere ciphers in comparison with that hero?" Purchase at any cost, and at once, this Homeric character. He who has begun the task has half done it. Have the courage to be wise.

Such gleams of Homer's soul, in the investiture of the Odyssey, may have been the happy fortune of Tennyson, the inspiration of his fragment on Ulysses—albeit some critics of the Victorian poet refer to lines in the twenty-sixth canto of Dante's *Inferno* for the germinal root. But the entire Victorian school, as did the Augustan school with Virgil for chief marshal, might well have flocked to the Iliad and Odyssey for observations and studies, for art that is no mere iridescent shell, but an embodiment of a spirit that still virtuously haunts our best aspirations. Compel the poetasters of our literature of mimicry, those clamorous monodists "of sex and soul," as Joyce Kilmer satirized them, to obey this command of Alexander Pope:

Be Homer's works your study and delight,
Read them by day, and meditate by night;
Thence form your judgment, thence your maxims bring,
And trace the Muses upward to their spring.
Still with the text itself compared, his text peruse;
And let your comment be the Mantuan Muse.

MICHAEL EARLS, S. J.

ST. JOSEPH'S SUMMONS

Silence within the lowly shop, and still
The song of bees beside the vine-wreathed door,
And sunbeams creep upon the clean-swept floor
Where once a gentle Child did play at will
And Joseph leaned to watch Him o'er the sill.
Sweet days that passed too swiftly with your store
Of memories golden! 'Twas an angel bore
The summons, as in Egypt, long before.
And so he rose to answer God's behest

And went upon the journey men call death,
As one who turns his willing footsteps home:
Eyes dull to things of earth and failing breath,
Folded the hands, like lilies on his breast,
When the King beckoned, saying: "Joseph, come!"

MABEL A. FARNUM.

REVIEWS

David Urquhart: Some Chapters in the Life of a Victorian Knight-Errant of Justice and Liberty. By GERTRUDE ROBINSON. With an Introduction by F. F. URQUHART. Illustrated. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. \$5.00.

Born a Scotch aristocrat in 1805, David Urquhart, the subject of Miss Robinson's interesting biography, became, after a rather desultory education, a great admirer of the Turks, among whom he lived for some years, adopting many of their customs, and being admitted to an extraordinary intimacy with them. He went to Constantinople as secretary to the British Ambassador in 1836, but fell out with his chief, and his diplomatic career was ruined. He then took up the cause of the down-trodden working men of England, and was largely instrumental in restraining the violence of the Chartists. Mr. Urquhart devoted his life to trying to prevent unjust wars and to having the Ten Commandments observed by the chancelleries of Europe. He blamed Russia for causing most of the political upheavals of the nineteenth century and actually surprised Mazzini into admitting that he had received Russian money for promoting "disorder" in Italy.

Though Mr. Urquhart never became a Catholic, he regarded the "Papacy as the only moral force in Europe." He had an enthusiastic admiration for the Middle Ages, when the Pope was the "Grand Justiciary of Europe," and when "Idealism, obedience, respect for authority, all the things that a vain and shallow pretense at independence professes to scorn, developed, instead of stultifying character, stimulated thought and safeguarded freedom."

Catholic readers will feel the keenest interest in the latter half of the book in which the author tells of Mr. Urquhart's relations with the Church. He was deeply concerned at the attacks on the Pope's temporal power, for they were the culmination, in his opinion, of lawlessness. Discovering with delight the Church's Canon Law, he longed to see it regenerating the world of today. It was this hope that made Mr. Urquhart an ardent promoter of the Vatican Council. He came to Rome, had an audience with Pius IX, kept in close touch with the prelates of the Council, strongly urged the passing of the decree on the Pope's infallibility, and was largely instrumental in drawing up a postulate to be presented to the Synod "*De Re Militari et Bello*" which has a remarkably twentieth-century sound, for it runs:

The present condition of the world has become almost insupportable by reason of the huge standing armies which are raised by conscription. The people groan under the burden which is laid upon them. The spirit of irreligion and the neglect of law in so-called international affairs open an easy way to wars, unlawful and unjust—or, to speak more truly, to the terrible slaughter which spreads over the world. Hence the resources of the poor are threatened, commercial relations are broken up, the conscience of men is involved in deep and deadly error, or it is grievously wounded, and many souls are plunged into eternal ruin. To so many and great evils the Church alone can provide a remedy.

As the Council was abruptly suspended by the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, Mr. Urquhart's postulate never came up before the Fathers. Perhaps when the Council is resumed some day, his excellent proposals will be discussed and acted on. Though Mr. Urquhart strove till the last to promote the practice of justice and sincerity in international relations he died

a disappointed man, May 17, 1877, leaving Pope Pius IX, from whom he had hoped so much, robbed of his dominions and a prisoner in his own palace.

W. D.

Ireland in the European System. By JAMES HOGAN. Professor of History, University College, Cork. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$5.00.

According to Mr. H. G. Wells' "Outline of History," "Ireland as a significant land did not enter the stage of history till the nineteenth century." That is only one of the countless historical blunders committed by Mr. Wells. In making such a statement he is gravely in error, says Mr. Hogan. The latter is right. With one stroke of his pen, Mr. Wells rubs out Ireland's splendid record of service to European civilization from the fifth to the tenth century. He forgets that centuries before the Renaissance in Italy Ireland had witnessed a revival of letters and that Greek, neglected to a large extent in the Middle Ages, had never entirely disappeared from the schools and monasteries of Erin.

Mr. Hogan's book then might be said to be a refutation of the reckless statement made by the author of the "Outline." Up to the beginning of the sixteenth century, according to the learned Cork professor, Ireland to a great extent had absorbed her conquerors. The Normans were unable to resist the fascination of Celtic life and manners, the colorful, gay and sparkling life of the people with whom they speedily became identified. But in 1539, under the absolutism of Henry VIII and his successors, Englishmen of a different breed and creed from the Catholic Norman conquerors, were sent to Ireland in the name of their sovereigns. England's grip became more tyrannical and her policies more definitely outlined. Mr. Hogan declares that those policies were based on two principles: that the security of England rendered necessary the conquest of Ireland, and that the only way to keep the Irish permanently impotent was to exterminate them. A few sentences quoted by Mr. Hogan from the poet Spenser's "State of Ireland," and which add little to the fame of the author of the "Faerie Queen," show to what an extent of barbarism the agents of the Tudors in Ireland were willing to go.

What was the result? Ireland seeing that alone she was unable to cope with her enemy, had to look abroad for military and financial help. This brought her prominently upon the stage of foreign affairs.

Mr. Hogan's volume, the first of a series, studies the external policies of Ireland from 1500 to 1557. It takes up, in separate chapters, such topics as Ireland and Louis XII; the Earl of Desmond; France and Austria; the House of Guise, Henry II and the Irish chieftains; the Irish at the Court of Henry II; France, the Northumberland Conspiracy and Ireland. The work is serious, interesting and built on secure historical foundations, a study of contemporary sources. It throws light on certain chapters of Irish history hitherto little known. It does not deal with Ireland's internal affairs. This connection between Ireland and Louis XII of France is so slight that it is rather surprising to see a whole chapter dedicated to the frail link that united them, the fact that Daniel MacNeill, Lieutenant in the Scotch Archers of Louis XI, the Archers in which Quentin Durward served, had been entrusted by Louis XI with some business in connection with the divorce of the future Louis XII and Jeanne de Valois. And Mr. Hogan treads too close to his documents not to be willing to correct the statement that Savonarola "for preaching a strict morality, was brought to the stake." He was brought to the stake in accordance with the rigorous discipline of the times, not for preaching a strict morality, but for fanaticism, disobedience and obstinacy.

J. C. R.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Mother Seton's Life.—The Sisters of Charity throughout the country, together with their numberless friends and beneficiaries will give a cordial welcome, no doubt, to Father Revillé's excellent sketch of "The First American Sister of Charity" (America Press, \$0.10; \$7.00 a hundred), Elizabeth Bayley Seton, the centenary of whose death is observed this year. The author adroitly weaves into his little biography of Mother Seton the contemporary events in the history of our country, such as the evacuation of New York by the British, the inauguration of Washington, the death of Alexander Hamilton, etc. In five picturesque and moving chapters entitled "A Lady of Old New York," "The Angel of the Lazeretto," "The Cross in Barclay Street," "The Lilies of the Valley" and "The Fruit of His Hand." Father Revillé follows the career of Mother Seton from her birth in New York, August 28, 1774, till her happy passing at Emmitsburg, January 4, 1821, describing her home life, her marriage to William Magee Seton, their journey to Italy, her husband's death there, her conversion in 1805, and the foundation of the new community at Emmitsburg four years later. In 1813 only eighteen Sisters took their vows, but the New York branch alone of the Congregation Mother Seton founded now numbers some 1,600 religious who have thirty-five convents, forty-nine parish schools, fourteen academies, one vocational school, six child-caring institutions, four hospitals, one home for the aged and one college; work covering a field from the Battery to the Bronx.

For Wives and Mothers.—Alice, Lady Lovat, dedicates to her children an excellent book on "Marriage and Motherhood," (Benziger, \$2.00), which our Catholic women will find full of sage counsels. "Holy Matrimony," "Pleasure Versus Happiness," "What Every Woman Should Know," "The Education and Training of Children" and "A Mother's Weapons," are titles of some chapters in the book. "Love, gratitude to God and the sense of past sacrifices," says Lady Lovat, should be the "triple cord" binding husband and wife together. She compares the woman, who at the call of duty refuses to be a mother, to a man who refuses to defend his country. "The importance of Catholic education is stressed, good suggestions about reading in the Catholic home are offered, rules for the nursery are set down and hints about housekeeping and the management of servants are given. Though Lady Lovat's volume does not seem to supply fully the needs of our Catholic married women, still "Marriage and Motherhood" is a book they can all read with great profit.

Fresh Novels.—"The Sixth Sense," (Doran, \$1.90), by Stephen McKenna, is one of the early works of the gifted author who has deservedly won such a vogue. It is marked by the same strong characterization, the same gentle sympathy with human nature, the same careful elaboration of plot that are evident in his other books. The subject is the modern young woman, attractive in many ways, but self-reliant, wilful and egotistical to the extreme.—"The House in Dormer Forest," (Doran, \$2.00), by Mary Webb, is a beautiful but dangerous novel. It preaches individualism and revolt against time-honored and accepted ideals and habits of thought. The only people in the story who are not pilloried are those who set at naught conventional religious standards. With the kind of religion that is held up to scorn, such an indictment was easily made plausible, but the theme of the author is much wider than the dark and platitudinous tenets to which she objects. The only cult for which she professes any reverence is the worship of the beauty of nature, to which, indeed, she is finely attuned. There are pages of great beauty in the book and others wholly lacking in decent reticence.—"Sons of the Sea," (Putnam, \$2.00) by Raymond McFarland, is a moderately interesting story of a sort of superman who does marvelous things with the utmost ease. The scion of a race of

heroes with the call of the sea in his veins, he shakes off the lethargy and indolence which his college education has fostered, and at the challenge of the girl he loves, proves his manhood, wins his place among his seafaring ancestors and incidentally the girl.—"Spring Shall Plant," (Doran, \$2.00), by Beatrice Harraden, is a rather clever description of the evolution of "Pantuffa" from a youthful shrew to a girl of promise. The rebellious, attractive child bullies or terrorizes every one, but affliction gradually tames her, and the story closes with the transformation of her obstinacy into ways of helpfulness.

SOCIOLOGY

Socialism in Spain

SPAIN is a Catholic country; certainly one of the most Catholic in the world. But to retain her Faith in its entirety she must battle no less, perhaps even in some respects more energetically, than we in the States. True, Spain's battle differs from ours. She has no divorce problem gnawing at her vitals; she does not witness her people, a simpler people for the most part and a more rural, hankering after amusements and frivolities; she has not the religious fads of Christian Science and Spiritism engaging the attention of many of her would-be intellectuals; but she has, apart from a certain apathy to religion in certain quarters, a problem that ought to engage the attention of her best minds to a greater degree than it has been thus far engaging them. And that problem is Socialism.

There is no denying the fact that in recent years there have been cast among the laboring classes in Spain the seeds of Socialism and Syndicalism. The laboring man found today in the industrial centers and in the mines, and, until a short time ago, on the railroads, is almost invariably a Socialist. By far the great majority of workmen have been contaminated with the poison of Socialistic doctrine.

ITS REMARKABLE GROWTH

THE reasons for this state of affairs must be sought from various sources. First of all there is ignorance. In some sections, particularly in the South, the amount of illiteracy is extremely high. I said in a former article that it reaches at times fifty or sixty per cent. Since then I have been informed on the very best authority that in places eighty per cent of the inhabitants are illiterates, and even in some towns ninety per cent. In a province more to the north, which is considered to have a comparatively low rate of illiteracy, we find according to Government statistics that thirty-seven per cent have never fingered the "Primer" nor learned to sign their names. And we might add, by way of parenthesis, that in Spain there is in execution, and has been for a long time, a system of education controlled by the Government much as our Smith-Towner bill would force upon us at home.

The result is that the Socialists have a clean slate on which to write their propaganda. There are few ideas to be expelled before their pestilential doctrines can find place; and falsehood is received as gospel truth. With conditions such as these one does not have to be a Demosthenes, nor even an accomplished soap-box orator, to make people believe that the Church and the clergy are allied against the workman, that they are never to be trusted, that Socialism is the millennium for the working man, that the capitalist must be overthrown and the workman reign in his stead. More easily too will all this be believed if the auditors, as is so frequently the case, have long since given up the practise of attending Mass, or as someone has put it, "the devotion of the fifty-two Sundays." And turning over the dusty pages of history the Socialist propagandist quotes every scandal in which priest or bishop figured from the earliest ages down to our time, as if these things were actually taking place today.

WANT OF RELIGIOUS CONTACT

ANOTHER reason for this deplorable condition, while not by any means directly ascribable to the clergy, must I fear be in some measure at least laid at their door. Invariably have

I found the Spanish clergy intelligent, well-trained, deeply religious, courteous and in every way priestly. But it is unfortunate that in many cases they have gotten somewhat out of touch with the working man. If they were confronted with the problems which face our priests in the States, they would not have lost this intimate contact with the humbler and more needy sheep of their folds. Here the priest has no church to build; his church has been standing for centuries. Often enough it is sufficiently dirty within to make one wish that an American vacuum cleaner would be turned loose to do its worst upon the dusty, overly-ornamented, thickly-gilded altars and overhanging arches. The parish priest has no church debt to pay off, no parish school to build and support. Hence he does not have to round up every stray sheep in his parish to see that each does his share in helping defray these expenses. Religion, the amount and intensity for the most part depending upon the individual teacher, is taught in the public schools. For his support, the priest receives a salary from the Government, ranging from 1,000 to 3,000 pesetas a year according to the rating of the parish. Even with the peseta at par, five to an American dollar, one sees at a glance that that is a mere pittance, being the same salary that the Government paid priests forty years ago. How a priest manages to live in these days on from \$250 to \$600 a year is one of the great marvels of the age. True, in the cities and larger parishes he receives offerings for Masses, baptisms and marriages; but in the smaller towns there are few of these. The priest then in Spain, partly by reason of not having to worry over the financial condition of his church, has little by little gotten out of touch with his people. This situation has been aided too by the fact that there does not exist that good custom, as in the States, of the parish priest visiting each family at least once or twice a year. He says his Mass, preaches his sermon, holds his devotions, and very often the church is not so thronged with the male portion of the congregation to the extent that one would like to see, or which he has been accustomed to see in so many of our American churches.

CLOSE ORGANIZATION

ANOTHER reason for the growth of Socialism has been the traditional attitude of employers towards their workmen. But who is to blame for that attitude? That question will be best answered by quoting the following incident. A short time ago on the occasion of a certain gathering of Catholics interested in social problems and in the condition of the workingman a priest rose to give his views, and to lay the blame for the present condition of the working man on the capitalists and employers, saying that they to a great extent had brought it on by their un-Christian way of treating the men. In answer there arose the Marquis of Comillas, certainly the leading Catholic social worker in Spain whose social work among the employees of his coal mines in Asturias we reviewed in a former article in AMERICA, who very calmly admitted that the accusation was only too true; "but," he quietly asked, "have the priests ever instructed the employers in their social duties and obligations towards the working man?" He said no more, nor was there any need.

And in the meantime Socialist propaganda, efficient, well-organized, untiring, is going on apace. A workman goes from an interior town for instance to work in an industrial center. There he sees Socialism in action. After a time he returns to his own town an ardent propagandist; Socialism has won another apostle. And thus the work goes on. Nor do the Socialists conceal their motives; they do not tell the people that they can be good Catholics and good Socialists at the same time. They immediately cut the bridge leading to Catholicism and even to Christianity; for the first booklet they scatter abroad upon coming to a town is one entitled: "Twelve Reasons Against the Existence of God." After that first and, I must say,

rather impressive impression has had a chance to sink in, comes the propaganda for Socialism proper, Syndicalism, Bolshevism. In some places in the South, radicals have so strongly entrenched themselves as to be able to erect their own schools, over the entrance of which the sign "*Ni Dios, ni propiedad, ni autoridad*," greets one's astonished eyes.

In the Socialist *sindicatos* or brotherhoods, there are admitted only Socialists; work is given only to those who enroll as Socialists; and so well organized are they that the brotherhood of one city is in touch with that of another. And thus, for instance, should there be work for stone masons in Oviedo but not in Burgos, the brotherhood of the latter city is informed of the fact so that the Socialist masons can migrate to Oviedo for work. Whole towns are thus brought under the control of the Socialists. They ensnare particularly the young men, lacking education and opportunities to advance and better themselves materially, in the shops and industrial centers; so that the young are lost to the Church, and the truth forever. For the young men are the first to be lost, and once lost are seldom regained. Facts show that the outrages and deeds of violence that take place in the various industrial centers are usually the work of the young men. It is ever the young that recognize an ideal, albeit a wrong one, and fight for it to the bitter end. Thus in Barcelona, the hotbed of it all, as well as in other cities, those who during the past few years have been killed on the streets fell victims to the hand of a young assassin.

SOCIALISM IN SPAIN AND ITS REMEDY

THE Spanish workman then is either Catholic or Socialist; there is no middle course, and sad to say the majority of toilers today are treading in the footsteps of Marx. I speak of the workman in the industrial centers and in the mining districts; in the agricultural regions, and Spain is essentially an agricultural country, the case is not nearly so bad. In fact, the sentiment of the rural population is extremely healthy and united in the cause of the Church.

Perhaps the cloud appears too black; black it certainly is and menacing, too, but it is the dark side. There is, I am glad to say, a bright side; and the silver lining which is beginning to tint this somber and menacing cloud that threatens Spain's horizon is the work that certain Catholics are doing, tardily begun it is true, to counteract the tireless propaganda of the Socialists.

One man, thoroughly alive to the dangers of the times, animated with an ideal, imbued with zeal for souls, yet thoroughly practical withal, has been able almost single-handed, in spite of opposition, to set on foot, and to carry on to an extent almost undreamed of by even his most optimistic friends and most enthusiastic admirers, a campaign that will undoubtedly prove a strong factor in the social regeneration of Spain.

EDWARD J. WHELAN.

EDUCATION

Charles Coppens, Patriot and Pioneer

SLIGHT of frame, almost fragile, with keen eyes and ascetic face, the face of a man in daily communion with noble thoughts, Father Charles Coppens bore about him the unmistakable marks of a son of St. Ignatius. But it was not the follower of Ignatius as he is depicted in the novels of Wilkie Collins or Eugène Sue. For never was soul more free from trickery and low cunning than that of this childlike scholar who passed from us three months ago in his eighty-fifth year. Of his long and useful life, sixty-seven years were consecrated to the cause of Catholic education, and nearly sixty to the actual work of the class and lecture room. That other Jesuit, Dominic Yenni, who spent fifty years in a class of Latin elements in Spring Hill College, amidst the pine groves of Alabama, drilling several generations of Southern boys in the lessons of his

own grammar, must, in length of service, yield the palm to Father Coppens. Both were educators after the heart of Ignatius, heedless of fame, teachers for the love of truth and the young, for the training of whom they were unusually gifted. The gentle figure of Father Charles Coppens should not be forgotten when we take stock of those quiet but ever-energizing forces which have contributed to the development of the Catholic Church in the United States.

A PATHFINDER

EDUCATED in the schools of his native Belgium and in the graduate schools of St. Louis University, and Fordham University, New York, Charles Coppens, though not gifted with extraordinary mental powers, became a thorough scholar. In all that concerned the substance and marrow of letters, the practical side of literature, history and asceticism, he was well read and had clear and sound views. He was not deeply original nor does he stand sponsor for any new method or discovery. Yet he was to some extent a pathfinder. At least, he blazed the trail and cleared the roadways over which others were to travel more easily. He was a clear-spoken message-bearer, a sincere and earnest conveyor of the truth. For many years his name was on the lips of every Catholic boy and girl in the high schools, academies and colleges of the United States. From the pages of his "Practical Introduction to English Rhetoric" they learned something of the art of composition, all perhaps that they ever knew of the properties of speech, of the unity of the sentence, of strength, beauty and harmony of style. By him they were introduced into the labyrinth of metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche. The book in some ways was old-fashioned and formalistic, built along old lines, but solid, substantial, even interesting. For it unconsciously breathed the spirit of the author, directness, sincerity, and love of the fair and the true. It taught thousands something of the beauty of English letters. For the classic gems scattered throughout the book, long lingered in the memory of those who pored over its pages. They gave them perhaps their first insight into the fairy land of romance and poetry. The "Introduction" did pioneer work for our Catholic schools. In this country nothing like it had been done before.

What is said of Father Coppens' first book must be repeated in still stronger terms of its fellow, the "Art of Oratorical Composition," a better conceived and stronger volume. To some extent, it has not yet been superseded in its substantial teachings, although modern book-making methods, if applied to it, might improve it in some details. But it is strongly fibered and of excellent structure. Hundreds of Catholic lawyers and Catholic priests have learned from it how to build a sermon and construct a plea.

A BROADLY-CULTURED MAN

THIS frail and delicate scholar was an indefatigable worker. His life is a hymn to perseverance and industry. He wrote, lectured and taught to his very last years. A lesson of perseverance and indomitable will-power is inculcated at every stage of his long and useful career. That is better even than the scholarship of which he was such a striking example. To a large extent it explains that scholarship. He was never idle. The most delightful of companions, simple and unaffected in conversation, with a rare courtesy, flavored with quiet humor, he spent his time with his boys and his books. He might be named *Carolus Comestor*. He devoured books, quickly assimilating their spirit and garnering their hoarded treasures. But, it was in no miserly spirit, not for himself, nor for the vain satisfaction of his own relish for the beautiful in the many literatures of which he was master. He was at home in many things. A painstaking writer, whether he wrote an article for the *Ameri-*

can Catholic Quarterly on Freemasonry, or contributed to the Catholic Encyclopedia a column and a half on the "Examination of Conscience," or blazed the trail by writing a textbook on medical jurisprudence, the first one in the English language, he everywhere showed the signs of a scholar by toil and conscientious research. He wrote with more solicitude for the substance than mere style, and out of the fulness of his knowledge and of his heart. His heart was as that of a child. So, though he is not a stylist, nor a finished artist with words, his books have a stamp of ease, simplicity, directness and quiet force which do effective work for the end he had in view, the spread of the truth.

One of the needs of the hour, one of the educational lacunae which American Catholics must fill as soon and as effectively as possible, is the training of the well-equipped and ready Catholic scholar, the ever-armed champion of the truth. We need the sturdy little David who can pick up the smooth pebbles from the running brook at his feet, tuck them snugly in the corners of his sling, and at the very moment when the boasting Goliath of error is shouting out his challenge, fetch about and bury them in his brazen forehead. Father Coppens once stated that his opportunities for learning in youth had been rather scanty. But he thoroughly made up for any deficiency in that regard. He seemed to be ready for any emergency. If there was a discussion or controversy going on about the Jesuits or the Reformation, he did not need long study or research to enter the arena. He had at his disposal copious stores of information, accurate and methodically arranged, from which he could immediately, while the fight was raging, pick his ammunition for the fray. The little pebbles he caught from the stream before him did effective work in his willing hands.

A look at the list of his works might lead one to think that he scattered his efforts on subjects but distantly related. It is scarcely to be expected that an author can write equally as well on the "Art of Oratorical Composition," and on "Moral Principles and Medical Practice." But Father Coppens felt that he was a soldier battling for the Faith. It mattered not to him whether he skirmished in the fields of literature in a lighter-armed regiment, or had to wield the heavier artillery of science and philosophy. He was a rounded man. He could be thrust at any moment into print or the lecture hall and by his learning and thoroughness command always the respect, often the admiration of his hearers. He wrote a splendid textbook, as we have seen, on the "Art of Oratorical Composition." His manuals of Moral Philosophy, of Logic and Mental Philosophy, his short History of Philosophy, while not its equals were thoroughly serviceable and practical. It is evident on reading them that the writer absolutely forgot himself and his reputation and thought only of the subject at hand and the good he might do.

A DEEPLY SPIRITUAL TEACHER

BUT there was another feature in the work of this Jesuit master far more characteristic of the man. He was deeply spiritual. Not only is this evident in those professedly ascetical works which he left us, such as "The Mystical Treasures of the Mass," "Spiritual Instructions for Religious," but the man's life, words and teaching, carried along with them an atmosphere of unworldliness, piety and holiness. He was as gentle as Francis de Sales. For Our Lady he had something of the tender love of John Berchmans, his countryman, and Stanislaus Kostka. In his first enthusiasm, a delicate boy, he had come to the United States with the Apostle of the Indians, Father de Smet, to give himself to the missions. But he never worked for the Red Men and never preached to them in their wigwams or by their council fires. For a life-time he was the missionary of the pamphlet, the textbook, the classroom, the conference hall and the lecture platform. Gentleness, simplicity, courtesy, an undefinable spiritual urbanity of tone and manner garbed him

as effectively as the Jesuit's robe that clung to his delicate frame which seemed to burn with a hidden flame. To come into contact with him was to realize that virtue was something attractive and noble. His books, whatever their subject, literature, philosophy, history, though never spoiled by anything like inopportune preaching, seemed unconsciously to instil abiding lessons for life. He had the art of interpreting science and literature in terms of the soul, and fully aware of the meaning of *litterae humaniores* was convinced that letters should humanize the scholar, make him more of a man in the noblest sense of the word.

After more than thirty years there linger in the mind of the writer the echoes of a lesson taken from Sallust's "Conspiracy of Catiline," as interpreted by Father Coppens. The passage gives first a striking eulogy of the virtues of olden Rome. Then in chiseled words, the Roman historian depicts the inroads of avarice, ambition, unbelief and cruelty: "*Namque avaritia fidem, probitatem, ceterasque artes bonas subvertit; pro his superbiam, crudelitatem, deos negligere, omnia venalia habere edocuit.*" Commenting on these words in his calm but impressive way, this great educator vitalized the brief sketch of the chronicler into a lesson suited to his Jesuit hearers, future missionaries, teachers and preachers of the Word of God. Sallust, Rome, and Catiline were for the moment forgotten. The struggle depicted by the Latin historian was, according to Father Coppens going on in the heart of every individual, and it was waged all down the ages with the same means, stratagems and vicissitudes which were depicted in the passage before them. Eternal vigilance, faith and self-control were the price, therefore, not only of liberty, but of peace, honor, virtue and the love of God. That commentary was a compendium of the teaching of this noble Jesuit scholar. His services to the cause of true education in the United States were eminent and most timely. He taught what he practised. His saintly life was the eloquent commentary of his written and spoken words.

JOHN C. REVILLE, S.J.

NOTE AND COMMENT

Chesterton on Ireland

MR. GILBERT K. CHESTERTON, who has been lecturing to delighted audiences in this country and who recently told an interviewer from the *Bookman* that he is not a "Roman Catholic—yet; that was not to say that he might not be—if the Church of England should become more Protestant," sent the *Manchester Guardian* last month a remarkable paper on "Ireland's Case as the World Sees it." He writes:

There are two broad impressions about the English in Ireland which are bewildering the whole world. The first is that England has abandoned the government of Ireland. What we are conducting now is not government at all. It does not really profess to be government at all. It is at the best war; and a very wild sort of war. And the second is that the war is of the particular sort now generally called Prussian war, and the English are still glowing with a recent and quite real indignation against it, when it was practised by Prussia.

We are not ruling Ireland. We are simply raiding Ireland, exactly as men raid across a frontier. And this first fact is of considerable concern in foreign policy.

Our rulers tell us they can never recognize Ireland as a separate nation. But, in fact, they are recognizing it as a separate nation. They are paying the plainest possible compliment to its independence; they are invading it. They are invading Ireland exactly as the Prussians invaded Belgium. Even the Prussians did not invade Prussia. They did not even invade Bavaria. Nor can our foreign critics bring themselves to believe that Britain is invading Britain.

Now all this to begin with, and apart from anything else, is of course very bad for British prestige. The other nations are surprised at our having lost Ireland so suddenly and

so completely, and at our confessing or proclaiming it so loudly and so furiously. It would certainly have been better for our international position, in any case, if we could have kept up some pretense of ruling Ireland like a fixed government instead of merely ravaging Ireland like a foreign invader.

Mr. Chesterton is of the opinion that "Exactly the same legend that grew up against Prussia is everywhere growing up at this moment against England," owing to her merciless oppression of the Irish. He says that the war in Ireland is widely considered a sign that the British Empire is breaking up, and that the next war with England will be deemed a Crusade, for "we are piling up a toppling tradition against ourselves which will make them regard us as the last survival of despotism."

K. of C. Plan for Italy

AFTER numerous conferences with Vatican officials the European Commissioner of the K. of C., Edward L. Hearn, states definitely that the work to be proposed to the Knights of Columbus in Italy will be the establishment of athletic clubs for the Italian youth throughout the country, with Rome as the center of activity. The entire undertaking is to be modeled on the American method of community welfare work. Mr. Hearn adds:

The people of Italy have a great esteem for the Knights of Columbus. The recent K. of C. pilgrimage to the Vatican, witnessed by large crowds in every city through which the Knights passed, confirmed the reputation which the K. of C. had received in Italy, through the Italian press reports and the verdict of the Italian military authorities, on the welfare work conducted in Europe by the Knights. Pope Benedict believes that the K. of C. are the only force that can successfully introduce to Italy American welfare methods that will mean the social salvation of the youth of Columbus' own country.

Surveys are at present being made in Italy, beginning with Rome, to estimate the cost of this work. If undertaken it will be supported absolutely independently of the K. of C. war fund. The entire matter will be decided at the meeting of the Board of Directors, at Washington, April 3. It is the earnest wish of the Holy Father to have this great enterprise launched at once by the K. of C.

Opposes Trade with Soviet Russia

IT is difficult, even at the present moment, to obtain any accurate and reliable information regarding Russia. Testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in regard to trade relations with the Russians, Mr. John Hays Hammond, whose acquaintance with that country has at all events been very intimate, held that Russia has nothing to sell and no money with which to buy. Commenting upon his report the editor of *Harvey's Weekly* writes:

Mr. Hammond's summarizations of his information are that Russia's agricultural resources are insignificant. She has no agricultural products to export. Her industries are at a standstill. Her transportation system is a wreck. What gold she has left is stolen gold, unavailable to the United States or to any other country entertaining objections to becoming a receiver of stolen goods. Whatever dribbles of commodities she may have for barter, will not get beyond the countries nearest to Russia's borders. Soviet Russia, in a word, is in a state of utter agricultural, industrial and commercial collapse.

Another objection raised by him is that even if our resumption of trade relations with Russia were possible, "an attempt in that direction would alienate the good will of those who sooner or later must gain control." He is optimistic concerning the country's future, believing that a sane democracy will ultimately be established there. What the developments of the future will be it is hard to say.